

Sewanee Theological Review

Editor: Christopher Bryan

Poetry Editor: Greg Williamson

Book Review Editor: James Dunkly

Managing Editor: Mary Ann Patterson

Cover Photo: Buck Butler

Editorial Advisory Board: O.C. Edwards (Chair), J. Neil Alexander,
Susan Bear, Lawrence A. Britt, Julia M. Gatta, Robert MacSwain,
John M. McCardell, and James Turrell

©2018 • The School of Theology • The University of the South • Sewanee,
Tennessee

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY IN DECEMBER (#1), MARCH (#2),
JUNE (#3), AND SEPTEMBER (#4)

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG NUMBER SF 77-50 • ISSN 1059-9576

All correspondence and manuscript submissions should be addressed to *Sewanee Theological Review*, The School of Theology, The University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee 37383-0001. Unsolicited submissions should be original unpublished works and will not be acknowledged or returned unless accompanied by self-addressed envelopes and sufficient return postage. • For matters of usage and form, authors should consult *The Chicago Manual of Style* (University of Chicago Press, 2003). • U.S. subscription rates: Individuals, \$30 annually, two years \$55, and three years \$80. Libraries, \$30 annually. • Claims of nonreceipt must be received within three months of publication (five months outside of the U.S.). • Some back issues from September 1977 are available from the business office at \$15 each. Microfilm and issues published before September 1977 must be secured from National Archive Publishing or ProQuest Information and Learning, both in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Recent issues on microfilm are available only to current subscribers. • Web access: <http://theology.sewanee.edu/seminary/media/publications/>; e-mail: str@sewanee.edu. • Please note that *Sewanee Theological Review* was named *St. Luke's Journal of Theology* prior to volume 34, number 4 (September 1991). • *STR* is indexed in *Religion Index One*, *New Testament Abstracts*, *Old Testament Abstracts*, *Religious and Theological Abstracts*, and *ATLA Religion Database*. • Biblical citations in English are from the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) unless otherwise noted. • The University of the South and *Sewanee Theological Review* disclaim any responsibility for statements of fact or of opinion made by contributors.

Sewanee Theological Review

formerly St. Luke's Journal of Theology

<i>Editorial: Must the Weak Acquiesce?</i> CHRISTOPHER BRYAN	315
Contributors	331
Preface PIERRE WHALON	335
A Primer on the Government of The Episcopal Church and its Underlying Theology ECCLESIOLOGY COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS	341
What is Ecclesiology? WILLIAM O. GREGG	375
Proto-Conciliarism in Acts 15 C. K. ROBERTSON	417
The Key to Understanding The Episcopal Church PIERRE W. WHALON	425
Conciliarism and the Ecclesiology of The Episcopal Church WILLIAM FRANKLIN	447
Towards a More "Ecological" Ecclesiology: Subsidiarity and Conciliarism in Context GEORGE SUMNER	495
What is a Bishop, Anyway? PIERRE W. WHALON	509

SERMONS AND REFLECTIONS

- Future LGBT priests: 527
Advocates for Christian orthodoxy
 IAN MARKHAM and PAUL MOBERLY MAZARIEGOS
- Homily for the Funeral of William Hoover Hethcock 537
 ROBERT C. LAMBORN
- Homily for the Funeral of Thomas Edward Camp 545
 ROBERT C. LAMBORN

POETRY

- Star-Bottom Boat 553
 PETER COOLEY
- The Passing 555
 WILLIAM VIRGIL DAVIS
- The Barn Owl 557
 ROB GRIFFITH
- A Declaration of Intent 559
 SOFIA STARNES
- Act of Worship 561
 N. S. THOMPSON

BOOK REVIEWS*Singularity*

—Christopher Bryan

O. C. EDWARDS JR.

565

*Virginia Cary Hudson, The Jigs & Juleps! Girl:
Her Life and Writings.*

—Beverly Mayne Kienzle

O. C. EDWARDS JR.

567

Editorial: Must the Weak Acquiesce?

CHRISTOPHER BRYAN

There is a deservedly famous moment in Thucydides' *Peloponnesian War* when the Athenians have the much weaker Melians at their mercy. The Melians appeal for compassion to Athenians' essential decency—to their sense of human rights. The Athenian generals' reply is realpolitik at its worst. Rights, they declare, only exist between equals. The Athenians will do what they please with the Melians because they can: "the strong do what they have power to do and the weak acquiesce" (*PW* 5.s 89).¹ In other words, might is right. Let bullies rule! The irony of the situation lies, however, in two facts of which Thucydides makes sure his audience is aware. One is that the Melians' appeal is in essence precisely the appeal that the Athenians themselves made some decades earlier when faced by the might of the Persian Empire. The other is that the logic by which the Athenians now respond to the Melians is precisely the logic by which they in their turn will be crushed some years later by the might of Sparta.

Such a pattern of events is, of course, not only to be found in pagan literature. It is in the Scriptures. The ancient Hebrews are

¹ δυνατὰ δὲ οἱ προύχοντες πράσσουσι καὶ οἱ ἀσθενεῖς ζυγωροῦσιν.

oppressed by the Egyptians. They cry to God in their suffering, and God hears them and delivers them so that... so that what? According the Scriptural narrative, so that they in their turn can go to the Promised Land and oppress the Amorites and six other nations worse than they themselves have been oppressed. The Egyptians merely set the Israelites to hard tasks. On the grounds, however, that God “gave us this land” (Deut. 26.9) the Israelites now feel free to *wipe out* those other nations: “you must utterly destroy them. Make no covenant with them and show them no mercy” (Deut. 7:2).

Now of course I am aware that there is in Scripture *another* narrative than this—indeed, I would say the *dominant* narrative, running in an entirely opposite direction. This second narrative speaks of *all* God’s creation as “very good” (Gen 1:31) and declares, indeed, that God’s people exists so that in Abraham’s seed, “*all* the families of the earth shall be blessed” (Gen. 12:3; cf. 22:18)—an idea that is wonderfully developed in the Second Isaiah’s words to God’s servant—“It is too light a thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to bring back the preserved of Israel; I will make you as a light for the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth” (Isa. 49:6). These words are in turn said of the infant Christ by the aged Simeon in the Temple at Jerusalem—Simeon’s song, *Nunc dimittis*, that Christians have been reciting in their evening prayers for millennia. Jesus himself is the light to enlighten the nations, and thereby also the glory of his people Israel (Luke 2:29-32). Jesus when lifted up from the earth is to draw “all people” to himself (John 12:32).

All this goes without saying, *or at least it ought to*. And therein lies the rub. For it remains there is an element in us that

prefers the former story, the brutal story, and is even willing to claim divine sanction for it, just so long, of course, as we are on the winning side. And it is a part of the Bible's faithful witness not only to the graciousness of God but also to the sinfulness of humankind that it does not hide that fact—nor does it hide its results. Israel, like Athens, will in her turn suffer defeat and destruction at the hands of the powerful. The Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Persians, the Greeks, and the Romans: Israel must succumb to each of these mighty races in their time. Here, too, "the strong actually do what they can and the weak acquiesce." The flip side of which, it turns out, is "they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" (Matt. 26:52).

Alas, in succeeding centuries we seem in these matters to have learned little either from Thucydides or from the biblical narrative. A great Jewish biblical scholar, Jon D. Levenson, suggests that there is a parallel between the Bible's account of Israel's rapacious negation of the nations who had preceded her and the way in which Christians later rapaciously superseded the Jews.² He is right. Indeed, throughout the two thousand or so years of Christian history, one sees Christians using these stories of Israel and the promised land to claim biblical warrant, directly or indirectly, for all sorts of abominable nonsense: the burning of heretics, Christian theft of lands from their previous inhabitants (including, of course, those lands that we now call "the United States"), babble about "master races", "manifest destiny" and "exceptional nations", and by bitterest irony, the only too evident involvement of "Christians" in the Nazi holocaust, wherein Israel herself becomes the Amorite to be exterminated.

² Jon D. Levenson, "Is There a Counterpart in the Hebrew Bible to New Testament Anti-Semitism?" *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 22 (1985) 242-60.

One might wonder why, in the course of reading through the collection of papers on Episcopal and Anglican identity, focussing somewhat on Anglicanism and the conciliar ideal, I should have found myself reflecting on such dark and depressing themes as these?

On the one hand, I suppose I did so because even Christian history, of which Anglican and Episcopal identity are certainly a part, displays almost as much a preference for the brutal story, the narrative in which “winners” do what they want and “losers” put up with it, as does any other part of the human enterprise. “They’ll know we are Christians by our love,” goes a well-known hymn,³ presumably following Tertullian’s famous description of pagan reaction to Christians: “look,” they say, “how they love one another!” (*Apologia* 39.7)⁴—apropos which I am inclined to think that Tertullian was more willing to indulge in wishful thinking than one imagined. Despite Tertullian *and* the hymn my own experience has been that non-Christians are as likely to be disgusted with us by our treatment of each other as they are to be attracted by the love that we claim to live by. Perhaps things were different in AD 200, but somehow I doubt it. In studying the history of the early church it is, as Hans Küng reminded us some years ago, “remarkable how often one reads of Marcionite martyrs. It was not the pagan state, but the Church, or alternatively the Christian State, which put them to death. The heretics had innumerable martyrs, tortured and killed by the

³ Peter Scholtes, “We are one in the Spirit”, written during the sixties. Despite its popularity among some Christians, I confess I find it dreary and monotonous.

⁴ “Vide,” inquit, “ut invicem se diligent!”

Church as well as by the Pagans.”⁵

On the other hand, there is a positive side to this. Amid the multiple ways in which the story of Christian division plays out in the New Testament, I am moved to consider the approach to Christian disagreement and division implied by the apostolic council in Acts 15. Let me at once concede that this central portion of Acts, the narrative pivot of Luke’s second volume, is replete with problems historical, interpretative and even textual. For those I refer my readers to the many splendid commentators—C. K. Barrett, Ernst Haenchen, Martin Hengel, Luke Timothy Johnson, Richard I. Pervo⁶ and others who have worked on the text—among whom they will find as much disagreement as agreement, but still much to enlighten. All those complications granted, I would assert nonetheless that the *main* issue of Acts 15 as the author understands it and wants us to understand it is perfectly clear.

Luke presents us with a scenario in which Christians find themselves in profound disagreement with fellow Christians. It could, I suppose, have been over anything, but it happens to be over the question as to whether it is necessary for pagans who turn to Christ to be circumcised. In our largely Gentile

⁵ Hans Küng, *The Church*, Ray and Rosaleen Ockenden, transl. (London: Burns & Oates, 1968) 248.

⁶ C.K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994-98; Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*, Bernard Noble, Gerald Shinn, and R. McL. Wilson, transl. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell / Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971); Martin Hengel, *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity*. London: SCM Press, 1979; Luke Timothy Johnson, *Acts*. Sacra Pagina. Collegeville, Minn.: Michael Glazier, The Liturgical Press, 1992; Richard I. Pervo, *Acts*. Hermeneia. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009).

churches it is easy for us to underestimate the gravity of this question for those who faced it in the first Christian generation. On the one hand, circumcision was clearly mandated in Scripture (Gen. 17:10-14), and Israel's faithful had suffered persecution and martyrdom for this mark of their faith (1 Macc. 1:60-62). So for a faithful Jew to have it suggested that in some cases circumcision no longer mattered might well sound like an invitation to apostasy, to denial of everything for which Israel had stood. On the other hand, for Paul, called to preach to the Gentiles, to insist that they be circumcised was to undermine the entire gospel, making what should have been dependent solely on the sovereign grace of God into something dependent upon a human "work."

The stakes could hardly be higher.

So what happens?

What happens, according to Acts, is that the various groups take council together—the so-called "Apostolic Council." Those of differing views listen to each other, and eventually arrive at a way forward with which everyone can live. "Come now, and let us reason together," God had said of old to a recalcitrant people and, "It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us," replied the Council of Jerusalem in a breath-taking assertion that it was possible to participate in such a conversation (Isa. 1:18; Acts 15:28).

Now as regards the historicity of the Apostolic Council, there is certainly a case for saying that Luke, looking back at the episode he describes over a distance of several decades, is presenting a very much simplified and even romanticized view of what actually happened, in which every one behaves better toward everyone else than was really the case. And that may be true. Certainly the bitter tone in parts of Paul's Letter to the Galatians suggests a debate over

these same issues that was considerably angrier and fiercer than that portrayed in Acts. All that, however, is beside the point. For the point is this: that Acts suggests *a way of approaching disagreement among Christians that does not involve bitterness but listening and dialogue, and some have seen that suggestion as a model that the church might use*. Hence the common, even if somewhat anachronous, designation of Acts 15 as “the first ecumenical council” is more meaningful than might at first appear. For seen in that light, the apostolic council appears as something that can be a model—an ideal—for the church at all times.

What historians call “the conciliar movement” arose in the pre-reformation church because that church was faced with matters of serious disagreement that could not be settled by either papal or scriptural authority. Scriptural authority could not settle them because there was no agreement as to how to interpret the relevant scriptures. Papal authority could not settle them because there were two (and then three) popes, all claiming that authority. Conciliarism—centred on the three general (or ecumenical) councils of Pisa (1409), Constance (1414–18), and Basle (1431–49)—endeavoured to heal the wounds caused by these rivalries, and had some success: most obviously in that it brought about deposition or resignation of the popes concerned. Its deepest and most permanent message, however, is surely to be found in its assertion that general councils of the Church—of which the Apostolic Council in Acts 15 may be seen as a prototype—were superior in authority to the papacy. This view was formulated in the decree *Haec Sancta* (also known as *Sacrosancta*) of 1415, which was evidently concerned make general councils a regular feature of the Western Church. The decree asserted that the Council of Constance

constitutes a General Council, representing the Catholic Church, and that therefore it has its authority immediately from Christ; everyone, of every rank and condition, including the Pope himself, is bound to obey it in matters concerning the faith, the abolition of the schism, and the Reformation of the Church of God in its head and members.⁷

The effect of all this was, at least in the short run, disappointing. Within the Roman Catholic Church, following the Protestant Reformation, Conciliarism took second place to papal authority. In 1460 Pius II, himself at one time sympathetic to the conciliarists, by his decree *Execrabilis* bluntly forbade the “execrable abuse, unheard of in earlier ages” whereby some presumed “to appeal to a future council from the Roman Pontiff”.⁸

There were reasons for this change of heart. Among them were mounting threats to Western Christendom from the Ottoman Turks, and the conciliarists’ own confusion—for despite the lofty claims of *Haec Sancta* they never reached any agreement even on matters so basic as defining the Church or accounting for the authority of a Council. Surely most important of all was, however, that in the case of the Czech reformer Jan Hus the Conciliarists themselves abandoned the narrative of peaceful

⁷ *Documents of the Christian Church*, 4th edition revised, Henry Bettenson and Chris Maunder, eds. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011) II.V.I; cited in Diarmaid MacCulloch, *A History of Christianity* (London: Allen Lane, 2009) / *Christianity: The First Three Thousand Years* (New York: Viking Penguin, 2010) 560.

⁸ *Documents of the Christian Church*, II.V.II.

dialogue that was their *raison d'être*. In 1415, the assembled clergy at the Council of Constance persuaded Sigismund, the Holy Roman Emperor, to renege on an imperial guarantee of safe conduct that had been given to Hus. In a disgraceful about-turn, the Prague reformer was then imprisoned in disgusting circumstances and afterwards burned at the stake. Not only did this suggest that ecumenical councils were not, in fact, capable of handling movements of reform in a constructive way, it also had the effect of turning Hus into a Czech martyr. An explosion of rage from the Czechs led to the creation of a separate Bohemian church—precisely the kind of result that ecumenical councils were intended *not* to produce. Above all, the episode showed that ecumenical councils, too, were on occasion as capable as anyone else of descending from godly dialogue to the Athenian generals' godless principle that might equals right.

And yet, despite all these failings, the hopes and aspirations of the conciliar movement have never been entirely forgotten, and it has continued to have some level of influence outside of the Roman Catholic Church, notably in Anglicanism. It was not, of course, that the Church of England considered General Councils to be infallible—indeed, quite the reverse. As Article 21 states bluntly, General Councils “have erred”—and for good measure adds that this is to be expected, “forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed by the Spirit and Word of God.” Here too the Lord's word holds good: “By their fruits you shall know them.” So Jeremy Taylor said of the first four ecumenical Councils that the Church of England held them in high regard, “not that they are infallible, but that they have determined wisely and holily” (*A Dissuasive from Popery* II.I. §I). Which, we might add, was in itself something a miracle, and

especially so when we reflect on the history of some of those early Councils and the politicking and bad faith that frequently marked and marred them.

None of that, however, prevented Richard Field, Dean of Gloucester and Chaplain to both Queen Elizabeth I and King James I, from believing that,

Notwithstanding, General Councils are the best means for preserving unity of doctrine, severity of discipline, and preventing of schisms when they may be had; and though they be not absolutely necessary to the being of the Church, yet are they most behoveful for the best, readiest, and most gracious governing of the same: and howsoever there may be a kind of exercise of the supreme jurisdiction that is in the Church by the concurrence of particular synods... yet the highest and most excellent exercise of the supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction is in General Councils. (*Of the Church* 5.48)⁹

⁹ The Council of Trent failed to qualify, in Field's view, because it was not truly a *general* council, but consisted only of those who already agreed to the basic Roman Catholic position. He is utterly scathing of those who act and think "as the papists do, who, excluding all the Christians of Graecia, Armenia, Russia, and Ethiopia, out of the fellowship and communion of saints, and (as much as in them lieth) casting them into hell, suppose a general meeting of those their own faction to be a general council" (*Of the Church* 5.48; similar points are made by Archbishop William Laud, *A Relation of the Conversation between William Laud and Mr. Fisher the Jesuit* §XXVII). To be fair to Trent's intentions, one should perhaps quote from the documents the thirteenth session, which read as follows: "The sacred and holy, general Synod of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost

For all these reasons, the present set of papers, which the *Sewanee Theological Review* has the privilege of publishing, and the present Anglican and Episcopal interest in and debate about Conciliarism that these papers manifest, represent aspirations towards something important. Of course Conciliarism of itself can no more be a solution to the problems of Christian disagreement and division now than it was in the fifteenth century. As the Article points out, General Councils have made mistakes, and that is because they are composed of imperfect human beings. But as we consider the history of councils as a whole, we surely see enough on the positive side to make it clear that they can be useful. If I may be forgiven an analogy, the relationship of Conciliarism to Christian division is not unlike the relationship of antibiotics to disease. No one who knows the facts will suggest that the antibiotics solve the problem of disease, but they are certainly useful tools to that end. No one should think that the calling of General Councils will of itself solve the problems of Christian division, but it can surely be a useful tool. And this

... grants, as far as regards the holy Synod itself, to all and each one throughout the whole of Germany, whether ecclesiastics or seculars, of whatsoever degree, estate, condition, quality they be, who may wish to repair to this ecumenical and general Council, the public faith and full security, which they call a safe-conduct ... so as that they may and shall have it in their power in all liberty to confer, make proposals, and treat on those things which are to be treated of in the said Synod; to come freely and safely to the said ecumenical Council, and there remain and abide, and propose therein, as well in writing as by word of mouth, as many articles as to them shall seem good, and to confer and dispute, without any abuse or contumely, with the Fathers, or with those who may have been selected by the said holy Synod; as also to withdraw whensoever they shall think fit" (Chapter VIII; text at <http://www.papalencyclicals.net/councils/trent>). This certainly sounds like an invitation to Protestants, although given the religious attitudes of the time, how far they might have been willing to trust its promises I do not know. Who, after all, could forget what the Council of Constance had done to Jan Hus?

moment, still early the twenty-first century, marked in all Christian communions, notably in the Anglican and Roman Catholic, by increasing demands by the laity that clerical hierarchy be accountable, and an increasing awareness on all sides that the promised guidance of the Christ's church into "all truth" is a promise of grace to the whole body—this is perhaps a moment for the tool to be tried again.

The bishops of Lambeth 1948 spoke of "dispersed authority", and building on that, a more recent Anglican report declares the purpose of such authority to be that it draws to itself the general mind of the faithful, of the whole church, lay and ordained.¹⁰ The report itself was, moreover, "discursive", in that it sought the views of non-theologians and tried to speak for "different voices... from the communion," *recognizing discord as well as*

¹⁰ I avoid the expressions *consensus fidelium* and *sensus fidelium* only because they seem at times to be used as equivalent to *sensus laicum*, as if they were special graces given to the laity, and the clergy were not included among "the faithful". John Henry Newman, with whom the expressions appear to have entered the English language, used "*sensus*" much in the way which our English word "sense" may be used ("One has a sense that this is right"): that is, to speak of a church person's "instinct" or "sense", but not thereby full understanding, of what the church believes ("On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine," *The Rambler* [1859]: 73). Vatican II referred to the *whole* people's supernatural discernment in matters of faith, "from the Bishops down to the last of the lay faithful" (*Lumen Gentium*, 12), and according to the English translator, understood *sensus* as referring to "the instinctive sensitivity and discrimination which members of the Church possess in matters of faith" (*Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, 7th edition, Austin Flannery, O.P., ed. [Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1984] 363, translator's note)—which seems very much in the general spirit of Newman. See further Benjamin J. King, "*Sensus Fidelium*", which is to appear as a chapter in *The Oxford Handbook of John Henry Newman*, ed. Frederick D. Aquino and Benjamin J. King (Oxford University Press: forthcoming 2018). I am very grateful to Dr King for his kindness in allowing me to look at this work before publication.

accord.¹¹ This last is perhaps crucial. I noted earlier that the Council of Constance in its actions over the matter of Jan Hus showed itself incapable of dealing constructively with proposals for reform. That was true, but the deeper problem was surely that it was incapable of dealing constructively with *disagreement*. My friend and colleague Benjamin King suggests that, “the mark of a successful council is how it treats the losers.”¹² The fact is, Christianity over the two thousand years of its existence has not been good at dealing either with disagreement or with losers. And perhaps here recent Anglican experience in particular may offer signs of a way forward. Through all the sound and fury that has accompanied and still accompanies the ordination of women and attitudes toward the significance of sexual orientation in the life of the church, the Anglican communion does seem somehow to be holding together, sometimes by fudging, sometimes by simply agreeing to disagree, sometimes by... heaven knows what! But it does seem somehow to hold.¹³

¹¹ Communion, Conflict and Hope: The Kuala Lumpur Report of the Third Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission (2008) §§61, 113; cf. §§17-18. I am indebted in these reflections to Dr King’s “Sensus Fidelium” (see note 10, above.)

¹² In an unpublished email, 6 March 2018.

¹³ I am struck, though not necessarily convinced, by the suggestion that this Anglican (Church of England) habit of living with disagreement has some relationship to British Anglicans being used to the British parliamentary system of government. It certainly true that the Parliament of the United Kingdom functions on the assumption that there exist Her Majesty’s government and Her Majesty’s opposition. The job of the government is to govern and the job of the opposition is to oppose. On the whole, it seems to function as well as any other system of government of which I am aware, and perhaps rather better than some.

There was a time when I found this Anglican habit of living with uncertainty profoundly disturbing. Not any more!¹⁴ Oliver Cromwell (not, as a general rule, one of my heroes!) spoke rightly when he said to the quarrelling divines of the Kirk, “Is it therefore infallibly agreeable to the Word of God, all that you say? I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may be mistaken.”¹⁵ And even if what we say *is* agreeable to the Word of God, what of that? Does that give us the right to abuse others? I referred earlier to Hans Küng’s comment on how many Marcionite martyrs there were—and, he might have added, how many pagan martyrs!¹⁶ As it is, Küng continues,

We may wonder how many of them were inspired by God in the very depths of their being, and inspired by the message of the gospel, like Marcion—and like Arius and Pelagius, Gottschalk and Erigena, Wyclif and Hus, Giordano Bruno and Blaise Pascal. And we must ask ourselves what, in the last analysis, counts in God’s eyes.

The more certain we are that we do not know the answer to that last question (and we don’t), the more humble and courteous we must be in dealing with those with whom we disagree and the more gentle we must be in our behaviour

¹⁴ See my “In Praise of Fudging,” *STR* 49, no. 3 (Pentecost 2006) 291-95.

¹⁵ Oliver Cromwell, in a letter to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (3 August 1650).

¹⁶ See e.g. Herbert J Musurillo, S.J., *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954).

toward losers—which is not, of course, to say that we may not disagree with them, but it is to say that we are to speak the truth as we see it *in love* (Eph. 4:15).

One final point: I have at times heard the General Synod of the Church of England, the General Convention of the Episcopal Church, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and Vatican II all alike dismissed as “talking-shops”, and surely none of them is or was ever perfect, none of them free from timewasting and silliness, none of them never made a mistake. But even talking-shops have their uses. As Winston Churchill said, “To jaw-jaw is always better than to war-war.”¹⁷ Many commentators from various viewpoints have noted a tendency toward violence in our society over recent decades: not only a breakdown of civil discourse in society generally, but also a tendency to violence in religion. In such a context, however fallible general councils or human councils of any kind may be, the mere fact of their taking place may have value. The ritual of negotiation—coming to the special place to meet, the unavoidable recognition of each other’s existence and inevitably therefore in some sense of each other’s rights, having to follow the rules of negotiation, allowing the other to speak and at least pretending to listen—all that play of ceremony, the ritual of honour and trust, must inevitably have *some* civilizing effect, even if those performing it know that they’re telling lies. The key word here, as Johan Huizinga has pointed out to us, is play: we are *homo ludens*, for like all creatures, it is by our play that we learn.

¹⁷ Words, or words to that effect, uttered by Winston Churchill during a White House luncheon on 26th June, 1954.

Now in myth and ritual the great instinctive forces of civilized life have their origin: law and order, commerce and profit, craft and art, poetry, wisdom and science. All are rooted in the primeval soil of play.¹⁸

The rhetoric of the Athenian generals is still with us, as loud and bullying as ever: "The strong do what they have power to do and the weak acquiesce." In recent decades we have had to listen to holders of high political office who boast that they care only for "winners" and that "losers" are by nature irrelevant. All the more reason, then, for the church to remind itself and possibly others that there are more excellent ways.

¹⁸ Johan Huizinga, *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play Element in Culture* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1955) 5.

Contributors

Peter J. Cooley is the director of creative writing at Tulane University and the poetry editor of *Christianity and Literature*.

William Virgil Davis's most recent book of poetry is *Dismantlements of Silence: Poems Selected and New*. His earlier books are: *The Bones Poems*; *Landscape and Journey* (New Criterion Poetry Prize and Helen C. Smith Memorial Award for Poetry); *Winter Light*; *The Dark Hours* (Calliope Press Chapbook Prize); *One Way to Reconstruct the Scene* (Yale Series of Younger Poets Prize).

William Franklin, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Western New York and dean emeritus of the Berkely Divinity School at Yale University, is a member of the Theology Committee of The House of Bishops of The Episcopal Church, and the General Board of Examining Chaplains, and the Board of the Archives of The Episcopal Church.

William O. Gregg is the resigned VI bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Eastern Oregon and assistant bishop of North Carolina, and most recently served as rector of Saint Paul's Anglican Church in San Miguel de Allende, México. Gregg's field is systematic theology. He has been an occasional contributor of

articles to various journals, including *Anglican Theological Review* and *Sewanee Theological Review*.

Rob Griffith's latest book is *The Devil in the Milk* (Kelsay Books, 2017), and his previous book, *The Moon from Every Window* (David Robert Books, 2011), was nominated for the 2013 Poets' Prize. He is the editor of the journal *Measure* and is chair of the Creative Writing Program at the University of Evansville, Indiana.

Robert C. Lamborn has served parishes in Indiana and New York before becoming rector of Otey Memorial Parish, Sewanee, in 2015. He holds the M.Div. from Sewanee and the D.Min from Virginia Theological Seminary.

Ian S. Markham is the dean and president of Virginia Theological Seminary and the professor of theology and ethics. With degrees from King's College London, Cambridge University, and Exeter University, he is the author of numerous books including *Understanding Christian Doctrine* (Wiley 2017), *Against Atheism* (Wiley 2010), and *A Theology of Engagement* (Blackwell 2003).

Paul Moberly is the assistant rector of St. Alban's Episcopal Church in Annandale, Virginia. He is a 2017 graduate of Virginia Theological Seminary in Alexandria, Virginia, and has an undergraduate degree from St. Olaf College in Northfield, Minnesota.

C. K. Robertson is canon to the presiding bishop for Ministry Beyond the Episcopal Church and Distinguished Visiting Professor at General Theological Seminary. Robertson serves as

general editor of the “Studies in Episcopal & Anglican Theology” series (Peter Lang Publishing), and has written over a dozen books including *Barnabas vs. Paul*, *Conversations with Scripture: Acts of the Apostles*, and *A Dangerous Dozen*.

Sofia M. Starnes, Virginia’s Poet Laureate from 2012 to 2014, is the author of six poetry collections, most recently, *The Consequence of Moonlight* (Paraclete Press, 2018). She is the recipient of a Poetry Fellowship from the Virginia Commission for the Arts, among other awards, including an Honorary Doctorate of Letters degree by Union College, Kentucky. Currently, she serves as poetry editor and poetry book review editor of *The Anglican Theological Review*.

George Sumner is the bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Dallas. He has an M.Div. and a Ph.D. from Yale and was formerly the principal of Wycliffe College. His most recent book is a commentary on Daniel for Brazos.

N. S. Thompson is a British poet, critic, and translator whose work appears widely in publications ranging from *Agenda*, *The Dark Horse*, *New Walk* and *Stand* to *The Spectator* and the *TLS*. His latest collection is *Mr. Larkin on Photography and Other Poems* (Red Squirrel, 2016); previous publications include the verse epistle *Letter to Auden* (Smokestack, 2010) and he co-edited the satirical collection *A Modern Don Juan: Cantos for These Times by Divers Hands* (Five Leaves, 2014).

Pierre W. Whalon is bishop in charge of the Convocation of Episcopal Churches in Europe. Besides serving as longtime

columnist for the *Huffington Post* and *Anglicans Online*, he has published two books, *Made in Heaven? How God acts in marriage* (KDP-Amazon, 2016), and *Laïcité : l'expression publique de la religion*, with Jean-Michel Cadiot (ATF-France, 2018).

Preface

PIERRE WHALON

It is truly a great honor to write the Preface to this collection of essays entitled *Re-membering and Re-imagining: Essays on The Episcopal Church*, for publication by the *Sewanee Theological Review*. The Ecclesiology Committee of the House of Bishops created what is essentially a forum for dialogue on the nature of the Church. This produced musings on the nature of the Church as a whole, as well as specific inquiries into our own Episcopal Church. Two previous editions appeared online, with the open invitation to add to the discussion. With this final edition, the Committee hopes that further dialogue will continue in other fora. In particular, the essays on subsidiarity and conciliarism by Bishops William Franklin and George Sumner, as well as my own, explicitly call for further conversations.

What is the Church? Is there one overall Church, or is one denomination or another the “true” Church? Who ought to run it, and how? Answering such questions is the field of study of ecclesiology. What is the local church, what is the Church universal, how are these constituted, and how do they live, are, among others, the basic questions that ecclesiologists ask. Further

questions concern how the Church ought to be, as opposed merely to what it is.

These issues have always preoccupied Episcopalians, as they have all Christian churches. But they are particularly acute for us, who are confronting several challenges, and considering how to adapt to the rapidly changing circumstances of our times.

A central issue is that of authority. From where does the Church get the right and power—the authority—to be and to do what it does? The answer is obvious: from God in Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit. There are abundant biblical metaphors for this relationship, among them the “temple of the Spirit” and the “Body of Christ.” Christ is the head and chief cornerstone; we are the living stones that build up the temple. Christ is the Head of his Body, of which each of the baptized is a part, a member or limb.

Christ left power to his disciples to forgive sins, to make changes, to “bind and to loose.”¹ And he has given commands to his Church, relayed through the Scriptures, to baptize, celebrate the Eucharist, to teach all he has taught us, to be witnesses to his Cross and Resurrection to the ends of the earth, and all this “not only with our lips, but in our lives.”² Among these are, for example, feeding the hungry, visiting the prisoner, clothing the naked, healing the sick, standing up for the powerless, and freeing the victims of spiritual and physical oppression.

¹ Mt 16:18-19; 18:18-19

² From the General Thanksgiving in the Daily Office in *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church* [henceforth BCP] (New York: Oxford UP, 1979), 101.

All of which is summed up in the earliest confession of faith: "Jesus is Lord."³ In this sense, there is no question of authority; it is settled. The Church waits, however, for the fulfillment of the mission of God in Christ, of which it is an instrument. "Christ has died," has happened; "Christ is risen" is a present fact; "Christ will come again" is in the future.⁴ We are still in "the middle of time."⁵ And therefore we have had to organize our common life by our own means, though not without the guidance of the Spirit.

To whom does the Church give authority to build and run the institution that can guarantee in the short run the cure of souls, the work of building up the faithful here and now? And in the long run, see to the faithful transmission of all that Christ has taught us, as some 800 generations of Christians have handed down to us today? Every Christian denomination has to answer these questions for itself, with each succeeding generation. Therefore, ecclesiology has to develop a moving viewpoint, from the inception of the faith to today. There are several theological methods for defining authority in the Church that have developed over the centuries, basically associated with the Roman Catholic Church, the Orthodox Churches, the Reformed Churches, and the churches of the Anglican Communion. Within that Communion is The Episcopal Church,⁶ based in the United States but also now

³ 1 Cor. 12:3

⁴ From Eucharistic Prayer A, BCP, 363.

⁵ The title of a well-known commentary on Luke's Gospel by Hanns Conzelmann: *Die Mitte der Zeit* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957). He analyses that gospel as a story developed to face the delay of the *parousia*, the return of Christ.

⁶ We clearly understand that this title of the church based in the United States and present in sixteen other countries sounds presumptuous, as there are other "Episcopal Churches" of the Anglican Communion. But it has become an official

present in sixteen other countries. The American Revolution wrenched the congregations of the Church of England in those colonies away from the mother church. The Episcopalians, as they were called then and now, had to organize themselves alone. The purpose of the present set of essays is to give some idea of the results of that effort, carried down to our day. For to consider the case of The Episcopal Church is not just a fascinating ecclesiological study. The question of authority in the Church, in particular, is as sharp as it ever has been in the life of our church today.

In order to organize its work, the Ecclesiology Committee of the House of Bishops decided to write a “Primer” as a history on which to base its theological reflections (it was first issued separately in October 2013, in French and Spanish as well as English, and is intended for wide use by itself, as well as in tandem with these essays).⁷ Then follow various articles, of varying length: The whole Church of Christ as image of the life of the Holy Trinity; the concept of the episcopate in Anglicanism; how the idea of a church council came to be the central organizing principle for The Episcopal Church; what being “servants to one another” looks like in the political life of the church; and the roots of its concepts in the Scriptures and the early Church. Two essays are new to this final edition: “Towards a More ‘Ecological’ Ecclesiology: Subsidiarity and Conciliarism in Context” by the Bishop of Dallas, George Sumner, and “What’s a bishop,

title of the church since 1967, and is now a habit of speech, and is often abbreviated “TEC”.

⁷ The *Primer* is available online at

https://www.episcopalchurch.org/files/documents/primer.on_tec_.pdf (Accessed November 30, 2017)

anyway?" by myself. The other authors have refreshed their contributions. Bishop Franklin's essay was added to the second edition, replacing an earlier effort, to which Bishop Sumner's article is a reply. Both bishops explicitly call for further dialogue on the relation between the General Convention of The Episcopal Church as final authority for that church, and the wider Anglican Communion and its global conciliar bodies. The issue of development of doctrine, always contentious, is at the heart of the matter.

The Ecclesiology Committee of the Episcopal House of Bishops is profoundly grateful to the *Sewanee Theological Review* for publishing *Re-membering and Re-imagining*. It is our hope that these essays will help further the cause of the first Episcopalians, as they considered how to live the Gospel and be the Church in their dramatically changed circumstances. We offer these essays toward this work, both to the lay and ordained leaders of our church and to the wider Communion, as we all consider what our changing circumstances require of us now, in the middle of time.

A Primer on the Government of The Episcopal Church and its Underlying Theology

ECCLESIOLOGY COMMITTEE OF THE
HOUSE OF BISHOPS

Fall 2013 (revised)

The following is an introduction to how and why The Episcopal Church came to be, beginning in the United States of America, and how it seeks to continue in “the faith that was once for all entrusted to the saints.”¹ Rooted in the original expansion of the Christian faith, the Church developed a distinctive character in England, and further adapted that way of being Church for a new context in America after the Revolution. The Episcopal Church has long since grown beyond the borders of the United States, with dioceses in Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador (Central and Litoral), Haiti, Honduras, Micronesia, Puerto Rico, Taiwan, Venezuela and Curacao, and the Virgin Islands, along with a Convocation of churches in six countries in Europe. In all these places, Episcopalians have adapted for their local contexts the

¹ Jude 3

special heritage and mission passed down through the centuries in this particular part of the Body of Christ.

“Ecclesiology,” the study of the Church in the light of the self-revelation of God in Jesus Christ, is the Church’s thinking and speaking about itself. It involves reflection upon several sources: New Testament images of the Church (of which there are several dozens); the history of the Church in general and that of particular branches within it; various creeds and confessional formulations; the structure of authority; the witness of saints; and the thoughts of theologians. Our understanding of the Church’s identity and purpose invariably intersects with and influences to a large extent how we speak about God, Christ, the Spirit, and ourselves in God’s work of redemption.

The study of the Church begins with history and governance: how it came to be and how it makes decisions. To understand how and why The Episcopal Church functions the way it does today, we must start with its origins in the Church of England. Many people continue to believe quite erroneously that King Henry VIII started his own church in order to get a divorce. The reality, however, is far richer and more complex.

In the Beginning...

Our Episcopal roots extend back a long way. Indeed, one could say that the Episcopal ethos can be found at the very beginning of Christianity, in a city called Antioch. There, an “encouraging” newcomer-turned-church leader named Barnabas and his bold apprentice, Saul of Tarsus, helped form something connected to, but distinct from, the church in Jerusalem. In the latter, Peter and the other apostles preached and healed, but did

A PRIMER ON THE GOVERNMENT OF 343
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
AND ITS UNDERLYING THEOLOGY

so always in the shadow of the Jewish temple. Their group, “the Way,” as it was known, was an inspiring, Spirit-filled community, but it was still a Jewish sect and its leaders still went daily to the temple where sacrifices were made.

Antioch was something else entirely, where Greeks as well as Jews heard the Good News proclaimed and formed a faith community entirely separate from temple and sacrifices, an intentionally diverse yet unified community. It was in Antioch, not in Jerusalem, that the disciples were first called Christians.² And it was from Antioch that Barnabas and Saul (now Paul), a new breed of apostolic missionaries, were sent forth to plant communities of faith, love, and hope wherever they went. Again, these churches would be marked by diversity as well as unity: “There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, but all are one in Christ.”³ It was rarely an easy task, for diversity is a nice word to say but a hard reality to appreciate. In places like Corinth, for example, the wealthier church members did not want to wait for those field workers and others on the lower socio-economic level before having their communal meal. The battle over recognizing the uncircumcised may now seem quaint, but then was quite grim.

Still, often despite its own infighting, the movement flourished. And what began there in one small part of the Mediterranean region soon spread throughout the Roman Empire, eventually reaching even the British Isles. Legend has it that no

² Acts 11:26.

³ Gal 3:28.

less a figure than Joseph of Arimathea, the follower of Jesus who donated his own tomb for the Crucified One's burial, traveled to those Isles and planted the gospel, where it took root and grew. However they came, certainly by the year 314 there were Christians in Britain, as representatives from there attended the Council of Arles. There is an unproven tradition that British bishops also were at the Council of Nicaea in 325, from which emerged the Nicene Creed that is still proclaimed week after week in our churches.

Over two hundred and fifty years later, those same isles witnessed the arrival of a somewhat reluctant missionary-monk from Rome named Augustine, sent by Pope Gregory I ("the Great"). This Benedictine monk was to bring the faith to the land of the Angles, or "angels" as Gregory called them. Augustine set up his base in the southeastern region known as Kent, where Æthelbert was king, for there the faith was already in existence, his queen, Berthe, herself being a believer. But the faith he encountered there looked and felt different than that which was familiar to Augustine. It was a Celtic form of Christianity, not Roman. Augustine wrote to Gregory, sharing his concerns, asking how he might show those Celtic Christians the error of their ways and help them to be more Roman. Gregory's reply evidences great wisdom as well as patience, urging Augustine to take the best of what he found, along with the best of what he brought with him, and worry less about the rest. Eventually, Roman ways would indeed win out, as prescribed at a synod or meeting in 664 in a northeastern town called Whitby, but Celtic ways and Celtic leaders would continue to influence Christianity in the Isles, even as the Benedictine tradition that Augustine brought with him was

A PRIMER ON THE GOVERNMENT OF 345
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
AND ITS UNDERLYING THEOLOGY

also a strong formational factor on the character of the English Church. The Benedictine tradition is markedly hierarchical. Broadly participatory, yes, but ultimately, the Abbot makes the decisions. The Benedictine ethos certainly was a factor in how authority, discipline, and order were conceived and exercised in the Church of England.

Augustine thus became the first Archbishop of Canterbury. Bishop Justin Welby's enthronement on March 21, 2013, marks him the 105th Archbishop. Since the re-founding of the Christian Church in England, there has always been an Archbishop of Canterbury.

This fact, among other things, shows that the Church of England today is the direct heir of the Church in Britain, as it has existed more or less for 1900 years. What happened in the sixteenth century was not the founding of something new. In fact, Henry VIII's assertion of his authority over his church stands in a long history of contention of European monarchs for control of the Church in their realms (the idea that the Pope has universal ordinary jurisdiction over the Catholic Church in all the world is an idea that the Roman Catholic Church itself did not officially make its own until 1870). The matter for Henry was not religious, theological, or ecclesiastical. It was purely a matter of governance and political power. Henry never rejected his designation as "Defender of the Faith" given him by Pope Leo X in 1521, and it remains to this day one of the titles of the Crown. Nor did Henry (or any of his successors) repudiate the hierarchy of the Church or its liturgical practices, including the use of the Creeds and ordaining bishops in the historical succession.

After his death, the first Book of Common Prayer was published in 1549, and a second Book in 1552, while Henry's son Edward was king, reflecting the growing importance of doctrinal concerns to the Church. After Edward's early death, Henry's daughter Mary restored England to the Roman Catholic Church. Meanwhile, the Protestant Reformation and its wars were raging across the Continent, and this could not fail but influence events in England. When Henry's last child to take the throne, Elizabeth, became queen in 1558, conflict raged between returning Protestants exiled under Mary and Roman Catholics. After Pope Pius V excommunicated her in 1570, having failed to have her dislodged from the throne by force, Elizabeth laid the foundation of the modern Church of England, with the Archbishop of Canterbury as spiritual head and the Crown as the governor of the church's temporal existence. This "Elizabethan Settlement" no longer has a monarch by divine right in charge, but has endured to this day.

It should, however, be noted that the conflicts on the European continent and that in England were different, though clearly not unrelated. Oliver Cromwell and the Commonwealth mark the zenith of the Presbyterian experiment in the Church of England as well as in the realm. The experiment ultimately failed after much turmoil and bloodshed. The ecclesial and civil decision was for the Church of England to be a reformed *catholic* church as manifested in, and defined by, its liturgical and sacramental life. Its historical episcopal polity was restored. This restoration constitutes nothing other than a rejection of the Presbyterian model of polity and a permanent embracing of the catholic, hierarchical polity within the Church of England and,

A PRIMER ON THE GOVERNMENT OF 347
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
AND ITS UNDERLYING THEOLOGY

by extension, for the worldwide Anglican Communion, including The Episcopal Church. "Anglicanism" (a nineteenth-century word) includes these basic concepts, which are markers of this distinctive way of being Christian, alongside Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and Reformed streams of Christianity.

An Episcopal priest named William Reed Huntington proposed in an 1870 essay a potential path toward reuniting churches especially divided after the American Civil War. He set forth four points that he called a "quadrilateral." These would form the basis on which the Episcopal Church could consider reuniting with other Christian bodies. In 1886, the House of Bishops meeting in Chicago approved Huntington's Quadrilateral, and two years later the Lambeth Conference endorsed it with minor changes. Remarkably, the "Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral" has become the touchstone of Anglican identity around the world, summing up as it does the essential features of an Anglican Church:

- (a) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as "containing all things necessary to salvation," and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

- (b) The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

ECCLESIOLOGY COMMITTEE
OF THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS

(c) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unflinching use of Christ’s words of Institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

(d) The 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.

As the first extension of the Church of England beyond the British Isles, the development of The Episcopal Church clearly shows the importance of each of these points to 18-century Americans.

English Colonies become the United States of America

Toward the end of Elizabeth’s reign, English colonies in the Americas began to grow after several tentative starts. As people who rejected her “settlement,” as it is known, began to cross the Atlantic in order to found what they hoped would be different churches, the Church of England colonists also started their own congregations. These congregations were deemed to be under the episcopal authority of the Bishop of London. With the help of missionary organizations founded at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) and the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (SPCK), the faithful in America significantly increased in numbers. Other colonists named them “Protestant Episcopalians”—Protestant because they did not recognize the

A PRIMER ON THE GOVERNMENT OF 349
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
AND ITS UNDERLYING THEOLOGY

authority of the Pope, Episcopalian because they were under the episcopal authority of a bishop.⁴

In some of the colonies, congregations sent representatives to occasional “conventions” in order to discuss matters of common concern. They were not legislative (today we might use the term “networking” to refer to these gatherings). London occasionally sent “commissaries” to oversee the life of the congregations in the colonies, or sometimes appointed the colonial governors to act as them, although these rarely intervened directly. Colonists could not be confirmed unless they traveled to England, for a bishop for the American colonies was never named. The SPG sent clergy to many colonies, and colonial churches recruited other clergy in England or found local men to send to England for ordination. By the time of the American Revolution, about half of the clergy were either born in the colonies or recruited for ordination there. Throughout most of the colonial period, the Bishop of London had nominal oversight of the colonial churches, but distance and the role colonial governments played in ordering church life made that oversight very different from that exercised by a Bishop in an English diocese.

As they were left to their own devices in terms of their local life, the American congregations enjoyed some leeway in ordering their own local affairs, including calling of clergy, erection of

⁴ The first use of the term seems to be in a polemic by M. de la Milletiere in 1651, to which Bishop John Bramhall replied. See *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall, D.D.*, vol.1 (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1842), p. cxxviii (accessed July 26, 2013 at <http://archive.org/stream/bramhallworks01bramuoft#page/n169/mode/2up>)

buildings, and so forth. Despite the often *ad hoc* development of these congregations over time and in different parts of the country, there was never any question that they all belonged to one Church, indeed, one diocese, under the jurisdiction and authority of the Church of England.

In 1781, the American Revolution was successful in throwing off the rule of the English Crown with the shocking defeats of the British Army and Navy at Yorktown and Chesapeake Bay. The war ended officially in 1783 with the Treaty of Paris. For many Episcopalians, this was a disaster. Many of the clergy left for Canada or England, along with some laity, and those left behind were no longer part of the established Church. Many church buildings, formerly property of the Crown,⁵ lay in ruins. The situation was somewhat different in Virginia, where many of its Church of England clergy had taken the American side. Death and dislocation, however, further reduced the ranks of the clergy. Some left the ministry for secular employment, and for nine years Americans had no way to ordain new clergy. The loss of support from the SPG left Episcopal congregations struggling to find new sources of funding.

On the other hand, those remaining were also proud to be "Americans." A new nation had been born from the struggle. No longer were the laity and clergy part of an official church of the land. Now they needed to adapt the church structure and polity to fit an ethnically and religiously diverse nation that had embraced representative government.

⁵ Even today, the properties of the Church of England belong in the final analysis to the Crown, that is to say, not just the monarch but also Parliament.

A PRIMER ON THE GOVERNMENT OF 351
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
AND ITS UNDERLYING THEOLOGY

Keeping the Faith... and Order

Just as the Church of England became “Anglican” principally by political struggles as well as doctrinal developments, so, too, The Episcopal Church developed after a political revolution. As new leaders emerged to address the situation, they realized immediately the need to adapt the Church they had inherited to new realities. In meetings between 1782 and 1785, when the first Convention met, it became clear that there was agreement on some basic points.

The first was that the Episcopalians wanted as much continuity as possible with the Church of England. There were to be no innovations in doctrine, and there needed to be uniformity across the board in discipline and worship, as well. They wanted and chose episcopal government, by bishops ordained in the historic succession. In 1782, William White, who later became the first Presiding Bishop, had even suggested that the priests ordain other priests if they could not get their own bishop consecrated by three bishops in the succession (he withdrew that suggestion three years later). The congregations were used to settling their own local affairs, voting at the congregational level, and now the former American colonies were now creating a secular government based on suffrage. Therefore, the Church’s government also had to rest upon the votes of clergy and laity.

In other words, the first Episcopalians translated Queen Elizabeth’s settlement, as they had come to know it, into democratic, parliamentary terms: the clergy still in charge of spiritual matters, the laity still in charge of temporal matters, and

always working together. The intention of catholic polity remained the same. The adaptation concerned how these structures and their work were to be done in a democratic context. Final authority in matters concerning all was vested in General Convention and, in due course, Executive Council between Conventions, to a lesser extent. The democratic process was woven into a system of shared leadership and responsibility that included the whole Church, lay and ordained.

In 1783, the clergy of Connecticut elected and sent Samuel Seabury to be consecrated in England. Since English law required, then as now, that bishops swear allegiance to the Crown at their consecration, Seabury had to go to Scotland to the Scottish Episcopal Church, a smaller Church independent of England. Their bishops agreed to ordain Seabury to the episcopate, and did so on November 14, 1784.

Also in 1784, three congregations in Pennsylvania met and asked all the churches in that state to meet together. When this statewide group met, it called upon all Episcopalians to come together to form an ecclesiastical government. Shortly thereafter, a second meeting was held at Christ Church, New Brunswick, New Jersey, with wider representation. Finally, a meeting in New York from 8 states came together in October 1784 and decided to attempt to call a "General Convention." This meeting asked that all Episcopalians organize in order to send deputies to this first Convention, which would hopefully serve them as the ancient councils of the Church had done in the first centuries.

The 1785 Convention marked the first time Episcopalians had met nationally to decide their own future apart from the Church of England, its canon law, the Society for the Propagation of the

A PRIMER ON THE GOVERNMENT OF 353
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
AND ITS UNDERLYING THEOLOGY

Gospel, and the Bishop of London. The colonial conventions had never had any power to make decisions (though some colonial governments did). The Convention decided to write a constitution and canon laws, create a Book of Common Prayer, and negotiate with England for the consecration of bishops for the American church. The Convention also made official the name of the "Protestant Episcopal Church," thereby validating what had already developed, formally and informally, in the former colonies.

By 1789 all these were in place. In 1786 a proposed Book of Common Prayer that would succeed the 1662 English Book in use then, was completed and began to be circulated. Negotiations between the General Convention and the Church of England bishops cleared several objections and concerns raised by the English bishops. In the same year, Parliament allowed for overseas bishops to be consecrated without the oath of allegiance. Finally, on February 14, 1787, William White and another Episcopal priest, Samuel Provoost, were consecrated bishops by the archbishops of Canterbury and York, and two other bishops. (A third, David Griffith, was prevented from making the journey.)

The third Convention⁶ met and adopted the first Constitution and Canons (unlike the United States Constitution, which was ratified by the individual states). It called for each official decision to be made by agreement of a House of Deputies (clergy and lay delegates from each state) and a House of Bishops. From the

⁶ September, 1785 and June 1786 (reconvened October 1786), both in Philadelphia, were the two previous.

beginning, the first Constitution made it clear in its second Article that

... if ... no deputies either lay or clerical, should attend at any General Convention, the Church in such state shall nevertheless be bound by the acts of such Convention.⁷

Article VII (now Article VIII) required all members of the clergy to “conform” to the “doctrines and worship” of the Church—which are decided by the General Convention. The 1789 Book of Common Prayer became the standard for worship for all parishes throughout the Church. There is no record of any congregation in the United States that did not accede unconditionally and irrevocably to the authority of the General Convention of the Episcopal Church. They had always been part of one Church, and never had the desire to belong to another. What changes they made were those made necessary by the American Revolution.⁸

⁷ *Journal of a Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the States of New-York, New-Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina, Held in Christ-Church in the City of Philadelphia, From July 28th to August 8th, 1789*, Philadelphia: 1789, pp. 23, 25. Already, the 1785 meeting had passed Article XI which stated, “This general Ecclesiastical Constitution, when ratified by the Church in the different states, shall be considered as fundamental; and shall be unalterable by the Convention of the Church in any state.” See *Journals of the General Conventions, 1785 to 1814*; accessed July 26, 2013, at <http://bit.ly/1aNub1L> Emphasis added. Note that the term “General Convention” formally belongs to the 1789 convention.

⁸ “We are unanimous and explicit in assuring your Lordships, that we neither have departed nor propose to depart from the doctrines of your Church. We

A PRIMER ON THE GOVERNMENT OF 355
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
AND ITS UNDERLYING THEOLOGY

Success at last!

In 1781, Episcopalians worshipped in scattered congregations across the eastern seaboard. They were all, nominally at least, part of the Diocese of London. Most had never seen a bishop, and many of them, as well as non-Episcopalians, were leery of the office.

General Convention created the means by which these congregations could live into the basic idea of the Church as the Church of England from which they came had developed it, but now in a new context. In order to participate in the life of the Church across the country, they were now required to organize into dioceses (although that term was not officially used until the 1830s. Before then they were “the Church in the State of...”). This meant that the Episcopalians could have bishops ordained in the ancient succession. These would be elected by their diocesan conventions, and approved for consecration by the General Convention (as was the rule at first).

If you look at the official seal of The Episcopal Church, you will see the red Cross of St. George from the English church. In the upper left-hand corner, there is a Cross of St. Andrew representing Scotland. This cross is itself made up of nine small

have retained the same discipline and forms of worship, as far as was consistent with our civil constitutions; and we have made no alterations or omissions in the Book of Common Prayer, but such as that consideration prescribed, and such as were calculated to remove objections, which it appeared to us more conducive to union and general content to obviate, than to dispute.” Reply of Convention to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, June 26, 1786. See *Journals of the General Conventions, 1785 to 1814*; accessed July 26, 2013, at <http://bit.ly/1aNub1L>

plain crosses, representing the original “state conventions” (which we now called “dioceses”) present at the 1789 General Convention. That seal represents the extraordinary achievement of the first Episcopalians of the United States.

While it may be said that this Church’s governance, at first glance, does not look quite like that of the Church of England, it is important to note that *no* other province of the Anglican Communion has a governing structure quite like that of England. It is inimitable, and exists in its peculiar shape because of the unique history of that country. But note the balance of the powers of the bishops and clergy on the one hand, and the powers of the laity on the other, at the congregational, diocesan and national levels. While the present monarch, Queen Elizabeth II, has only a formal role in governing her Church, she symbolizes the considerable power that the laity exercise across England. This original balance of her great ancestor’s Settlement has been a key element of Anglican provinces around the world, including the Episcopal Church, the first Anglican Church outside the British Isles.

With some modifications—for example, prayers for the Monarch now became prayers for the President of the United States—the 1662 Book of Common Prayer continued to order the corporate liturgical life of Episcopal parishes. The 1789 Book began to steer a somewhat different course, incorporating materials from the 1764 Scottish Holy Communion rite (from the Church that ordained Seabury). Throughout its revisions, the Prayer Book has faithfully continued to embody the essential understanding of Christian faith as prayed by the faithful: Episcopalians are a biblical people gathered by Word and Sacrament. We are a people of

A PRIMER ON THE GOVERNMENT OF 357
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
AND ITS UNDERLYING THEOLOGY

catholic order and polity as reflected in the Ordinal and in the conduct of our various liturgies. We are a people whose prayer shapes our lives and whose lives are a fundamental part of our prayer. We are a people who continue in the traditions of the ancient Church, reflected in our liturgies of the Daily Offices and Sacraments, the Outline of the Faith (Catechism) as well as our polity, and our commitment to how we live in the world each day. In this way, The Episcopal Church not only has staked its identity in the historic church and faith, but also clearly and intentionally has done so in a manner that remains explicitly linked to the Church of England (and Scotland) and the Anglican tradition of being both “reformed and catholic.”

The particular commitment to the Orders of Deacon, Priest, and Bishop is also part of remaining loyal to the faith and order of the Church of England. Participation in General Convention led to the creation of dioceses, the traditional regional communions of congregations, that could send authorized deputies to vote for them. Within a few years, bishops were in charge of all the original dioceses. And after 1835, missionary bishops, elected by the House of Bishops, held jurisdiction over all areas where no diocese had yet been organized.

Comparing and contrasting

The Episcopal Church succeeded in faithfully translating the four elements of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral into American life, indeed, eventually articulating them in the form accepted around the world today. One should not overlook the similarities between the English and the American churches,

therefore. In their daily life, both look almost identical. The English Church is more democratic than American Episcopalians tend to think, and the Episcopal Church is more hierarchical than English Anglicans often believe.

The basic dissimilarity lies in the adaptations made by the first Episcopalians. These were necessary for a suddenly disestablished group of congregations without any American diocesan or national church structures, transitioning from a monarchical state government to a republican one. Its founders were concerned to keep a certain local autonomy along with the tradition of the English church. Not only was this part of the colonial inheritance, with its relative congregational freedom, it was also part of the political theories of the day.

This point needs developing. It is often asserted that the same people wrote both The Episcopal Church's Constitution and the federal Constitution of the United States. It is not so. Although Church members were prominent in government, there is only one person (Charles Pinckney) who served both at the convention drafting the U.S. Constitution and any of the General Conventions between 1785 and 1789. No members of the 1789 Congress served as a deputy to any of these Conventions. While many of the Founding Fathers were indeed Episcopalians (like George Washington, for example), there are very significant differences in the founding documents of the Episcopal Church and the United States. They may share a common commitment to ideals of broad participation in governance, but leading a nation and overseeing the Church of Jesus Christ are very different things!

So the General Convention created and adopted the Constitution, without referring it first to the several state

A PRIMER ON THE GOVERNMENT OF 359
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
AND ITS UNDERLYING THEOLOGY

conventions (in fact it was originally their reason for being). From the beginning until now, it has limited its decisions with respect to specific local situations, but in making decisions for the whole church, its authority is supreme. Only a successive General Convention can undo the decisions taken at another. The genius of the Episcopal Church's governance structures has been the ability to set clear parameters for faith and church order that are not subject to local ratification or alteration, while granting the necessary latitude to make decisions at the local level for matters of concern to those Episcopalians, within the parameters of the Constitution and Canons. Over the years there have been attempts to assert "states' rights" in the church, just as in the country's history. Over and over, the foremost nineteenth- and twentieth-century commentators on the government of The Episcopal Church have refuted this, and the General Convention has never passed any legislation tending in that direction. While each diocese indeed has significant latitude in ordering its life in adaptation to its local needs, it cannot make decisions that affect the whole Church, including itself.⁹

⁹ In his summary at the 1852 trial of Bishop George W. Doane, John Henry Hopkins, then Bishop of Vermont and future Presiding Bishop during and after the Civil War, wrote: "With respect to the other phrase, AN INDEPENDENT DIOCESE, a definition is equally desirable. According to my judgment, it is a phrase without any meaning, unless it be a very bad one. A diocese cannot be independent in its legislation, because its laws must always be subordinate to the General Convention of the whole Church, of which it is but one member. If its Bishop be infirm, and it be required to give him an Assistant, it cannot be independent, because it must have the consent of the whole Church for the consecration of the elected person. If its Bishop be dead, it cannot be independent, because, without the same consent, it cannot have a successor. And

During the strongest attempt to undo the federal Union, the Civil War, the successive Conventions simply refused to recognize the absence of the dioceses of the Confederate states. With the war over, they were reintegrated as if nothing had happened.¹⁰ That first General Convention made possible in theory today's 109 dioceses, recognizing each one in turn when the General Convention established them.

Another difference between the English and the American churches is in the limiting of the authority of bishops in the exercise of episcopacy. From the beginning, the Episcopal bishops had their powers somewhat limited by their diocesan "standing committees." For example, an English bishop decides alone whether to ordain a properly vetted candidate. An Episcopal bishop must first secure from the diocesan Standing Committee a certificate saying that all canonical requirements have been met for the ordination of a particular candidate. Furthermore, the authority given the General Convention's House of Deputies

if its Bishop be the subject of evil report, it cannot be independent, because the other Bishops are the only tribunal in the Church who are authorized to try, and either acquit or condemn him. The truth is, that this phrase can never be reconciled with genuine Catholicity. It belongs of right to the Puritan school, and its influence all tends in a schismatic direction." Bishop Doane was acquitted. Accessed January 11, 2013, at <http://anglicanhistory.org/usa/gwdoane/trial1852.html>

¹⁰ The founders of the Confederate church made it clear that they founded it only because the Confederacy considered itself a new nation, not because they wanted a new church. However, the General Convention never recognized any of its acts. For example, the Confederates had created a diocese of Arkansas and chosen a bishop for it. The General Convention ignored this decision, and Arkansas had to wait ten years before the Convention made it a diocese of the Church. (Some have commented that these statements do not describe in detail what happened; but no one has claimed that, broadly speaking, they are not historically accurate.)

A PRIMER ON THE GOVERNMENT OF 361
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
AND ITS UNDERLYING THEOLOGY

requires the House of Bishops to work together with them in making decisions, although there is usually the traditional division of labor between “spiritual” and “temporal” matters in which House considers which resolutions first.

Just as the Elizabethan Settlement made the Crown and the Church work together, sharing leadership, the Episcopal version has leadership shared among all the ministers of the Church: Laypersons, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. This is true at the congregational and diocesan levels, as well. The ordained assist the whole Church by accepting responsibility for worship, the Church’s principal act; for the faithful proclamation of the Gospel, the teaching of the Faith, and the administration of all the sacraments. The laypeople take responsibility for finances, and for maintaining the properties of the congregation for the use by the rector for ministry. Most importantly, they do the work of God’s mission in the world. However, it is the whole people of God—all the Baptized—who share together the responsibility for the life and work of the Church in the mission of God.

The single most obvious difference between the Church of England and the Episcopal Church is in the General Convention’s consistent refusal to create an archbishop. In the Church of England, as well as many other (but not all) Anglican Provinces of the Communion, an archbishop exercises what is termed “metropolitan” authority. Metropolitan authority is essentially that which a bishop exercises over other bishops in a region or nation, a “supervisory authority for defined purposes.”¹¹ The Pope

¹¹ As defined routinely in Church of England documents. Norman Doe points out that among all the provinces of the Anglican Communion, not one defines

exercises that same authority in the Roman Catholic Church throughout the world, as do the Orthodox Patriarchs in their national churches.

Episcopalians have, since 1785, consistently assigned final authority and function in our church to the General Convention itself. In between Conventions, there is an elected Executive Council whose task is to carry out the policies and budget set by Convention. It is presided over by the Presiding Bishop, elected by the House of Bishops and ratified by the House of Deputies. The vice-president of the Council is the President of the House of Deputies, elected by the Deputies. However, major decisions must await the judgment of the General Convention through the agreement of both Houses.

The Presiding Bishop of The Episcopal Church functions somewhat differently from most “metropolitical” figures in the Anglican Communion. The Constitution and Canons of the General Convention define the roles and functions of the Presiding Bishop. The direct power and authority of the office are situated within the parameters set by the Convention. Nonetheless, as a peer of the archbishops in the Communion, the Presiding Bishop has carried since the 1982 Convention the title of “Primate” (as well as “Chief Pastor”). In a real sense, the title indicates a “first among equals” understanding of the office.

this type of authority in its canon law. See his *Canon Law in the Anglican Communion: A Worldwide Perspective* (London: Clarendon, 1998), 107.

A PRIMER ON THE GOVERNMENT OF 363
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
AND ITS UNDERLYING THEOLOGY

What does this all mean?

This Primer has tried to explain how the distinctive shape of The Episcopal Church began in the United States. Episcopalians following the American Revolution wished to remain loyal to the understanding of the Church as it had evolved in England, along with their own traditions that had developed during the colonial period.

We should also recognize that this form of church government, at once hierarchical and democratic, has not prevented the Church from supporting unjust structures of society. The African-American experience in The Episcopal Church, outlined in the Timeline below, shows how slowly the Church moved from the acceptance of slavery to the full and free participation of African-Americans in the life and governance of the Church. Similar histories hold true for women, Native Americans, and gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered people. Yet remarkable saints of “all sorts and conditions” of humans have come forth in the power of the Spirit throughout our history, whose lives and witness have changed and continue to change the whole Church.

For today’s Episcopalians living in seventeen countries around the world, this history and theology form our inheritance. What the first General Conventions bequeathed to us is a way of being Church that has proven very fruitful. In 1820 the Domestic & Foreign Missionary Society was created, to which every Episcopalian now belongs. Soon there were Episcopal dioceses across the country, and outside the United States. While

remaining a numerically small church, what began in America—the first Anglican Church not under the English Crown—has spread around the world. One-quarter of the thirty-nine provinces of the Anglican Communion owe their existence to The Episcopal Church. While no other province has perfectly copied its form of governance exactly (the principle the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral calls “local adaptation” prevents that), its distinction from the polity of the Church of England has encouraged others to establish their own particular way of being the Church of Jesus Christ in their own places and times, while remaining faithful to the ideal of a catholic Church that reforms itself.

All Christians need an ordered church.¹² Our particular way of being church tries to establish and maintain the conditions of an ordered freedom for the flourishing of all. How this happens is through the participation of every Episcopalian through prayerful voting in representative bodies devoted to “upholding and propagating the historic Faith and Order set forth in the Book of Common Prayer.”¹³ Even within The Episcopal Church, this life looks somewhat different in, say, the Diocese of Haiti than in the Diocese of New Hampshire. Yet both dioceses belong to the same Church.

And that Church belongs to a global communion of Churches, each trying to practice “ordered freedom” in its own way, yet with results that remain remarkably faithful to the ideals developed in the Church of England from the earliest days of the Body of Christ. At a time when many voices are calling for

¹² Gal 5:1; compare with 1Cor 10:29.

¹³ See the Preamble to the Church’s Constitution.

A PRIMER ON THE GOVERNMENT OF 365
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
AND ITS UNDERLYING THEOLOGY

changes in The Episcopal Church's governance, it is good to recall where we have come from, for our ancestors in the Faith have made us who we are today.

Timeline

Up to 400 A.D: The Roman period; Christianity is planted in Britain; the Council of Nicaea is held in 325, with representatives from Britain attending?

400 – 600: Celtic Christianity develops in the British Isles.

597: Augustine and his companions arrive in Canterbury.

664: The Synod of Whitby is held.

600 – 1300: The Middle Ages; in 1215, King John accepts the Magna Carta, still a statute in England and Wales.

1300 – 1500: The harbingers of the Reformation; Jan Hus burned at the stake in 1415.

1517: Martin Luther ignites the Reformation with his 95 Theses.

1534: The Act of Supremacy gives the Monarch, not the Pope, authority over the Church in England.

1547: Henry VIII dies, and is succeeded by Edward VI.

1549: The first Book of Common Prayer is published.

1552: The second Book of Common Prayer is published; Queen Mary ascends to the throne the next year.

1558: Elizabeth becomes Queen of England; the 1559 Book of Common Prayer is issued; many "puritans" return from Geneva to England.

1603: Elizabeth I is succeeded by James I.

ECCLESIOLOGY COMMITTEE
OF THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS

- 1607: A colony is established in Jamestown, Virginia, and a Eucharist there marks the beginning of a continuous presence of the Church in America.
- 1640 – 1660: Oliver Cromwell makes the Church of England “puritan.”
- 1662: The restoration of Crown and Church; catholicity of the Church of England is renewed; the 1662 Book of Common Prayer is issued, still the official Prayer Book of that Church today.
- 1701: Thomas Bray initiates the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, eventual sponsor of some 300 missionaries in the American colonies.
- 1776: American colonies declare independence from Great Britain; France and Holland soon offer their official recognition.
- 1783: Peace treaty with England acknowledges the United States of America.
- 1784: Samuel Seabury consecrated Bishop in Scotland for Connecticut; Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York meetings call for a “General Convention” to ensure the continuity of the Church in a new era.
- 1785: First Convention plans Constitution, Prayer Book, consecration of bishops, adopts name “Protestant Episcopal Church.”
- 1786: Second Convention—first draft of the Book of Common Prayer; consecrations of William White and Samuel Provoost approved by English bishops under Parliament’s new law.

A PRIMER ON THE GOVERNMENT OF 367
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
AND ITS UNDERLYING THEOLOGY

- 1789: Third "General" Convention ratifies Constitution and Book of Common Prayer.
- 1804: Absalom Jones ordained as priest; first African-American to be ordained.
- 1817: General Convention charts the General Theological Seminary in New York City, under leadership of Bishop John Henry Hobart.
- 1819: First diocese after 1789 organized in Ohio; Kentucky (1832), Tennessee (1834), Illinois (1835), and Michigan (1836). The first created by division was Western New York in 1839, which marks the first official use of the term "diocese."
- 1820: The General Convention launches Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society; although originally a club which persons had to join, the Convention in 1835 reconfigured the DFMS to be the whole Church in which all Episcopalians are thereby members.
- 1835: General Convention establishes office of Missionary Bishop. Missionary bishops now required in new territories to organize missionary districts and missionary dioceses. Jackson Kemper immediately ordained as first missionary Bishop.
- 1861: Attempt to organize a Confederate Episcopal Church begins.
- 1865: General Convention quietly reintegrates the southern dioceses.
- 1867: St. Augustine's School (now College) chartered by the Protestant Episcopal Freeman's Commission.

ECCLESIOLOGY COMMITTEE
OF THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS

- 1868: General Convention establishes Commission of Home Mission to Colored People.
- 1875: The Diocese of Haiti is admitted.
- 1878: Bishop Payne Divinity School established for African-American students.
- 1883: General Convention rejects "the Sewanee Plan" to create "Missionary Organizations" to separate formally white and black Episcopalians.
- 1886: The House of Bishops ratifies the Chicago Quadrilateral, with the Lambeth Conference approving it in 1888.
- 1889: General Convention approves canon "Of Deaconesses."
- 1906: Board of Missions establishes the American Church Institute for Negroes (ACIN) to support religious and vocational training.
- 1917: Edward Thomas Demby (Arkansas) and Henry Beard Delany (North Carolina) elected Suffragan Bishops; consecrated in 1918. First African-American bishops in the United States.
- 1919: The National Council (now Executive Council) is established.
- 1937: General Convention establishes the Joint Commission on Negro Work.
- 1944: Henry St. George Tucker resigns as Bishop of Virginia and becomes the first full-time Presiding Bishop.
- 1949: National Council, ACIN, trustees agree to close Bishop Payne Divinity School. Merged with Virginia Theological Seminary in 1953.

A PRIMER ON THE GOVERNMENT OF 369
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
AND ITS UNDERLYING THEOLOGY

- 1959: Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity (ESCRU) formed.
- 1964: General Convention passes a canon that all Episcopalians have equal rights. Bishop James Pike “recognizes” Phyllis Edwards, a deaconess, as a Deacon in Holy Orders.
- 1967: General Convention establishes the General Convention Special Programs to address issues of race and poverty.
- 1969: John Burgess elected Bishop Coadjutor of Massachusetts (diocesan 1970). First African-American diocesan bishop.
- 1970: General Convention approves constitutional change allowing women to serve as Deputies. Deaconess canon repealed; women allowed to be ordained Deacon.
- 1971: Harold Stephen Jones elected Suffragan Bishop of South Dakota, first Native-American Bishop
- 1974: Ordination of first eleven women to the priesthood
- 1976: General Convention approves proposed Book of Common Prayer on first reading; provides for ordination of women to all three orders; declares that “homosexual persons are children of God who have a full and equal claim with all other persons upon the love, acceptance, and pastoral concern and care of the Church” (A069-1976); shortly thereafter a group of congregations breaks away and forms an alternative church, though it soon fragments into various bodies.

ECCLESIOLOGY COMMITTEE
OF THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS

- 1977: The Rev. Dr. Sr. Bernadette (Ellen Marie Barrett), OSB, was ordained a priest by the Rt. Rev. Paul Moore, Jr., Bishop of New York. First openly gay woman to be ordained.
- 1978: General Convention created Navajoland out of the Episcopal dioceses of Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona, as an “area mission” dedicated to Navajo language, culture, families, and area events.
- 1979: General Convention approves 1979 Book of Common Prayer; affirms traditional understanding of the place of sexual relations to be within marriage between a man and a woman.
- 1989: Barbara Harris becomes the first woman ordained to the episcopate.
J. Robert Williams ordained on December 16, 1989 by John Shelby Spong, Bishop of Newark. First ordination of an openly partnered gay man.
- 1990: Walter Righter, then Assisting Bishop of Newark, ordained Barry Stopfel, an openly partnered gay man, to the diaconate; Bishop Spong ordained him priest in 1991.
- 1991: Steven Charleston elected Bishop of Alaska, first Native-American diocesan bishop.
- 1993: Otis Charles, father of five, having resigned as Bishop of Utah for several years, steps down as Dean of Episcopal Divinity School, and publicly announces that he is a gay man.
- 1996: Bishop Righter goes on trial for heresy in having ordained Stopfel; trial court rules that “... there is no

A PRIMER ON THE GOVERNMENT OF 371
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
AND ITS UNDERLYING THEOLOGY

Core Doctrine [of the Church] prohibiting the ordination of a noncelibate, homosexual person living in a faithful and committed sexual relationship with a person of the same sex..."

1998: Rwandan Bishop John Rucyahana asserts episcopal authority over an Episcopal parish in Arkansas, the first breakaway since 1977; later, Lambeth Conference Resolution I.10 asks for pastoral inclusion of gay and lesbian people, but posits that "homosexuality is incompatible with Holy Scripture."

2000: The Anglican Mission in America launched in Singapore on January 29 with consecrations of Charles Murphy and John Rodgers by Moses Tay, Archbishop of the Province of South East Asia; John Rucyahana, Bishop of the Diocese of Shyira in Rwanda. They were assisted by C. Fitzsimmons Allison, the thirteenth Bishop of the Diocese of South Carolina, Alex D. Dickson, the first Bishop of the Diocese of West Tennessee, and David Pytches, Bishop of Chile, Bolivia and Peru.

General Convention Resolution D-039 acknowledged that "there are couples in this Church" not living in marriage but "in other life-long committed relationships" and states that it "expect[s] such relationships will be characterized by fidelity, monogamy, mutual affection and respect, careful, honest communication, and ... holy love."

ECCLESIOLOGY COMMITTEE
OF THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS

- 2003: V. Gene Robinson elected and consecrated Bishop of New Hampshire, the first openly partnered gay person at the time of his consecration.
- 2004: Archbishop Rowan Williams appoints the Windsor Commission; its resulting report calls for moratoria on other provinces setting up alternative jurisdictions in North America, on the consecrations of openly gay people, and on same-sex blessings.
- 2005: Episcopal House of Bishops declares temporary moratorium on all episcopal consecrations; by request, delegations from The Episcopal Church and the Anglican Church of Canada voluntarily refrain from taking their seats as members at the Anglican Consultative Council meeting in Nottingham, but stay on as observers.
- 2006: Katharine Jefferts-Schori elected as Presiding Bishop and Primate, the first woman to hold that position, as well as the first scientist, as she was formerly an oceanographer.
- 2008: Anglican Church of North America constitution approved under Robert Duncan as Archbishop. Some Anglican provinces call for it to be recognized as the North American province of the Anglican Communion.
- 2010: As incursions in the United States continue despite the moratorium, Mary Glasspool, the second openly partnered gay person at the time of her consecration, is consecrated Suffragan Bishop of Los Angeles.
- 2012: General Convention approves a provisional rite of same-sex blessings following the 2000 Convention's

A PRIMER ON THE GOVERNMENT OF 373
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
AND ITS UNDERLYING THEOLOGY

resolution D-039, not a new rite of Holy Matrimony; House of Bishops calls for the appointment of an Ecclesiology Committee.

- 2015: General Convention approves for trial usage two rites of marriage for same- or different-sex couples, and revises the canon on marriage to enable their use, with the approval of the local diocesan Bishop. The Convention elects Michael Bruce Curry, the first African-American Presiding Bishop.

The Ecclesiology Committee wishes to thank those who helped make this Primer infinitely better, especially Dr. Joan Gundersen, and the late Canon Cynthia McFarland.

Members of the Ecclesiology Committee of the House of Bishops

The Rt. Rev. John Buchanan
The Rt. Rev. Ian T. Douglas
Mills Fleming, Esq.
The Rt. Rev. R. William Franklin
The Rt. Rev. Mary Glasspool
The Rt. Rev. William O. Gregg
The Rev. Canon Charles K. Robertson
The Rt. Rev. Allen Shin
The Rt. Rev. Pierre W. Whalon

What is Ecclesiology?

WILLIAM O. GREGG

Choosing a Starting Point

In this essay, I will be looking at what seem reasonable potential starting points for thinking theologically about the Church. A clear, explicit starting point is important because it will shape the argument and direction for developing a theology or pastoral practice, or a way of thinking about a topic. It is, for example, important to know that John Macquarrie was deeply influenced by the philosophy and methodology of Martin Heidegger; that Richard Hooker's thinking was shaped especially by the Greek Fathers and Thomas Aquinas. This essay will focus on possibilities of where to begin, but will not work out in detail where a particular starting point may take us theologically. I seek primarily to define the theological discipline of "ecclesiology," and to show why it matters to every Christian.

The word, ecclesiology, comes into English from Greek: *ecclesia*, meaning an assembly called together, later applied to the Church as an "assembly of Christians"; and, "logos" meaning the logic or reasoning of something. At this level, then, "ecclesiology" is the study of the logic or reasoning of the assembly of Christians.

A broad definition is: Ecclesiology is the theological discipline, within the faith, that reflects on and expresses the meaning, purpose, roles, and functions of the Church in the best, clearest language possible.¹ Another way of putting it is to define “ecclesiology” as the disciplined, theological thinking about the Church – what it was/is, who we were/are, what we/it did/does – precisely as Church.

Ecclesiology is not only thoughtful. It is also the product of prayerful reflection, within the faith, on what the Church is and what the Church does. The activity of prayer by anyone attempting to do theology is essential. Theological thinking is always and necessarily within the context of the daily process of speaking with God and listening with the ear of our heart.² It is equally essential to understand that doing ecclesiology, as with all theology, is not merely an intellectual exercise isolated in an ivory tower of abstraction. Theology always properly moves toward the concrete, the incarnational, and this is particularly important within the tradition of Anglican theology, spirituality, and praxis. Therefore, the disciplined, intellectual examination of what it

¹ For his definition of “theology,” see John Macquarrie, *Principles of Christian Theology*, rev. ed. (London: SCM Press, 1977), xi, 1. I would note two things about Macquarrie’s definition that also apply to my adaptation here. (1) Theology properly understood is an “in-house” activity. That is, the practice of theology occurs within a particular faith or religion by one who is a practitioner or member of that faith or religion. When one steps outside of one’s own tradition, then one is engaged in “religious studies” as Macquarrie understands the matter. (2) Theology is a disciplined, intellectual activity that uses language as its primary mode of conveying content about a particular topic. Theology is a process of thinking. It is not the same as, or interested in how a person “feels” about salvation, resurrection, or ecclesiology.

² Saint Benedict, *The Rule of Saint Benedict*, Ed. Joan Chittister (New York: Crossroad, 2010), Preface, 3.

means to be the Body of Christ must ultimately be situated in our world, in our time, in our particular circumstances, with the people who are there. Thus, ecclesiology articulates the theological core of the Church, out of which emerges its life and work as institution, as community, as Body of Christ. Each of these dimensions of church embodies itself in the world through participation in the *Missio Dei*, the Mission of God,³ in specific, concrete ministries.

The Anglican tradition frequently speaks of the “three-legged stool” of Scripture, Reason, and Tradition. A fundamental theological principle has always been that our theology, and hence, our ecclesiology, must be consonant with Scripture. It is therefore appropriate to begin with Scripture as the first starting point. Scripture, however, is not necessarily a simple or clear place to begin. It is well known that the New Testament does not prescribe any one particular ecclesiology. Rather, there are, in fact, several possibilities to be found. Yet, what it does do is offer clear and compelling witness to the fundamental nature, roles, and functions of the Church.

St. Paul gives us a clear and succinct description of what/who the Church is in I Corinthians 12 and Romans 12: we are the Body of Christ, the *Σωμα Χριστου*.⁴ It is with this biblical starting point that I begin.

³ Beginning in the mid-twentieth century, the understanding of the Church’s mission began to change. “It is not that God’s Church has a mission, but rather that God’s Mission has a Church,” is a formula often quoted. Vatican II’s *Ad gentes*, on the mission activity of the Church, even speaks of the mission of Christ and the mission of the Spirit. See n.1; see also George Summer’s point in his essay, “Towards a More ‘Ecological’ Ecclesiology: Subsidiarity and Conciliarity in Context.”

⁴ Cf. Ephesians 4.1-6; Galatians 3.26-29.

The Body of Christ

Paul's use of the body image in both I Corinthians 12 and in Romans 12 is one of his most powerful and striking images.⁵ It is certainly concrete, and it is an image with which all of us can identify, for we are each a body. We are intimately aware of what it is to be a body. As Karl Rahner argued, our body is our first and primary mode or means of presence to ourselves and to each other.⁶ Especially as we grow older, we are aware that our body is made of intricately and intimately connected parts, some large and some so small we cannot see them without a microscope. A body is a contained bio-system. How each part works affects the whole system. Paul carefully underscores the systemic nature of the body in his declaration that no part can say to another part, "I have no need of you."⁷

Paul is very clear: we are the Body of Christ and Christ is the Head of the Body. It is also clear that the Body of Christ is knit together as a body by the Holy Spirit.⁸ St. Augustine was equally clear about the implications of this ecclesiological reality in a sermon, in which he said that when coming to the Eucharist, "Be what you see. Receive who you are."⁹ Being the Body of Christ, then, is both an ecclesiological reality and a sacramental reality. We are the Body of Christ, in which the Holy Spirit dwells,

⁵ I Corinthians 12.12-27(28-30); Romans 12.4-5(6-8).

⁶ Karl Rahner, "Theology of Symbol," in *Theological Investigations IV*. (New York: The Seabury Press, 1974): 224-27; 234f.

⁷ 1Cor 12:21.

⁸ See Romans 8.9-17; cf. I Corinthians 3.16 and 12.1-11.

⁹ Augustine of Hippo, *Sermo*, 272.

constituted sacramentally through Baptism and sustained by the Body and Blood of Christ whose body we are and Who is our Head. The Body of Christ is created and fed sacramentally to be the sacramental presence of Christ in the world. This is the core of the identity of the Church.¹⁰

It is worth noting at this point, I think, one of the apparent tensions within the New Testament about the Church. Differently than St. Paul, St. John in the Fourth Gospel speaks of Christ's indwelling of the faithful: "I am in you and you are in me..."¹¹ The image is less concrete, focusing on the intimacy of real relationship with the Father through the Son in the Spirit that creates and sustains the faithful both individually and as community (the Church). Both St. Paul and St. John share a common understanding of the community as held together by the Holy Spirit. Both understand the intimacy of relationship between Christ and the Church, one in the image of the Body of Christ with Christ as Head, and one in terms of the indwelling of the Father in the Son and the Son in the faithful, such that as the Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father, so shall the Son be in the faithful and the faithful in the Son. The Holy Spirit, the Advocate in the Gospel of John, is the power and the presence of God that hold the Church together. They both share the understanding that the Church is derivative of Christ.

¹⁰ See Edward Schillebeeckx, *Christ the Sacrament of Encounter with God* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963), Chapter 1, "Christ the Sacrament of God," esp. pp.13 – 40; and chapters 2 and 5. I would note further that it is important to understand that the Church qua Church is not a continuation of the Incarnation. Rather, the Church is the means of Christ's ongoing presence and work in the world as empowered by the work of the Holy Spirit. Church, then, is simultaneously both a Christological and pneumatological expression of God.

¹¹ Jn 17:21.

So already in the New Testament among the Gospels and Epistles, there are differences of imagery and emphasis, which reflect variations in ways of thinking about who and what the Church is. Among the variations on the theme, St. Paul's Body of Christ image gives us a clear and coherent starting point for developing a biblically grounded ecclesiology.

Perhaps first and foremost, the image of the Body of Christ presents us with an understanding of Church as one, single body. In the language of the Nicene Creed, the Church is "one, holy, catholic, and apostolic." There is and can be only *one* Body of Christ.¹² It is from this perspective that, for the Orthodox, schism is the worst sin in or against the Church.¹³ What many in the

¹² It is out of this image as well as the fact of there is only one Christ, that the *ur-principal* of ecclesiology emerges: the essential unity of the Church, the "one, holy, catholic, and apostolic" Church *is* Christ. Hence, the fundamental question of ecumenism is the question of how to reunify the Church. For Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox, it is the ground, both of their position that the Church *is* the Roman Church or Orthodox Church, respectively, and all other claims to being Church are at best profoundly defective or simply false. Vatican Council II in the Dogmatic Constitution, *Lumen Gentium*, articulated a major substantive shift in Roman Catholic thinking by claiming only that the *fullness* of the Church "subsists in" (*subsistit in*) the Roman Church. LG 1.8 "Hæc Ecclesia, in hoc mundo ut societas constituta et ordinate, subsistit in Ecclesia Catholica..." [This Church (the one Church of Christ) in this world as a society constituted and organized, subsists in the Catholic Church...]

¹³ It is beyond the scope of this essay, which seeks only to give a definition and starting point for ecclesiology, to delve into this point at length. It is a profound and fundamental question of ecclesiology, which the various parts of the Body of Christ have managed for centuries to make insoluble. That, however, is entirely different from whether or not the matter *actually is* insoluble. See *Church of the Triune God*, The Cyprus Statement of the International Anglican Orthodox Theological Dialogue, 2006, (London: The Anglican Communion Office, 2006). See also the important work of John Zizioulas on ecclesiology, especially, *Being is Communion*, (Yonkers, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997); *Communion and Otherness*, (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2006); *The One and*

Christian world have apparently forgotten, ignored, or refused to own is the foundational difference, at least as I see it, between how one understands “unity” and “oneness,” as well as the role of diversity or differentiation within unity.

Among other things, we, as churches, have created a distorted ecclesiology that at least theoretically assumes that “unity” requires “oneness” in the sense of sameness, simplicity, and no differentiation or diversity. In so doing, there is a “meta-ecclesiology” that manifests in (1) an assumption that we must all be the same as to belief and forms of polity, governance, liturgy, theology, *etc.*; (2) a denial of diversity within the Body of Christ either as a matter of fact or as a matter of praxis; (3) an unhealthy focus on the negative, that is, on what another ecclesial body is *not*, which at the very least, theologically and practically, leads to an inability and unwillingness to see and value the gifts of the various parts of the Body of Christ which these bodies *are*; (4) exacerbates differences and elicits judgments of “bad,” “deficient,” “defective,” or, in the extreme, “not (real) Church”; and, therefore, the existence of the other is a sign of “brokenness” and “division” which must be “fixed”; (5) fosters deep and ongoing division and hostility born of a refusal to recognize one another as parts of the “one, holy, catholic, and apostolic” Church, which while essentially *one* is also essentially diverse or differentiated into various parts; and, (6) a failure to distinguish among *esse*, *bene esse*, *plene esse*, and *adiaphora*.¹⁴

the Many (Muntinlupa City, Putatan: Sebastian Press Publishing House, 2012); and *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2001).

¹⁴ That is, the essence of the Church, its wellbeing, the fullness of the Church, and matters that are not essential.

Theologically, particularly in our day, beginning an ecclesiology with St. Paul's image of the Body of Christ is especially potent and rich. An ecclesiology grounded in the concept of Body of Christ provides a framework and a foundation for an understanding for the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church that is a unity in Christ its Head, in the power of the Holy Spirit with the Father, and precisely as the Body of Christ in all the glory of its diversity and differentiation among all the parts of the Body. The theological and actual focus of such an ecclesiology is seeing the whole and within that whole to see and receive each part as it is. In this context, the Body of Christ focuses the energy of the Body on learning and living into how each part best functions with all the parts that makes it possible for the Body of Christ most fully, effectively, and faithfully to participate in *God's Mission*. The concern is not "church/not church" or "right/wrong" or "same/different". Minimally, an ecclesiology of the Body of Christ allows the assumption of recognizing all baptized persons, of whatever denomination, who have been baptized with water in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as part of the Christ's body, the Church. The focus of discernment is rather on the adequacy or fullness of expression of the Church in a particular part. How do we recognize the *esse* of Church and how do we recognize where that *esse* subsists?¹⁵ The Anglican Communion, through its Bishops gathered at the Lambeth Conference of 1888, adopted the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral as its response to the ecumenical question, "When is Church present in another ecclesial body?"¹⁶ Today, and in the context of a

¹⁵ Cf. Paul Avis, "Becoming a Bishop," unpub. MS, 2014.

¹⁶ Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral originated in The Episcopal Church and was

Body of Christ ecclesiology, the question would be modified to ask, “*How* is the Church present in another ecclesial body?”¹⁷ Patriarch Athenagoras II, following the 1976 decision of The Episcopal Church to ordain women to the priesthood, made clear that for the Orthodox, this was not something they could accept or embrace; however, while it meant that the purpose and goal

adopted in 1886, and then taken to the Lambeth Conference of 1888, where, with amendment, it was endorsed by the Bishops of the Anglican Communion (as it was coming to be called). It has subsequently frequently been interpreted as defining the essential marks of the Church from an Anglican perspective. The Quadrilateral names what were considered the *esse* of the Church, which, from the Anglican view, articulates the minimum elements constitutive of Church. Its intention was and is to include, not exclude. The first three items name universals about which there is no disagreement among Christian ecclesial bodies: The necessity of Scripture as the Old and New Testaments, the Baptismal Symbol and the Nicene Creed, and the two Dominical Sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist. The fourth element, the necessity of the historic episcopate, is a point of ecclesiological debate among Christian ecclesial bodies. Especially in the context of a Body of Christ Christology, it is important to note a singular phrase in the fourth item. “[L]ocally adapted” intentionally opens the *form* of historic episcopate to many possibilities. Implicit to where the Church subsists is catholic polity of the Church as the λαος Θεου—the People of God—within which are three ordained Orders (Bishop, Priest, Deacon). In typical Anglican form, we have clarity expressed with an intentional ambiguity. Even as Hooker argued in *Lawes*, while the historical formulation and configuration of catholic polity may be the best available, neither that form nor its particular configuration as he knew were necessarily the actual form of polity or the particular configuration that would exist (without change) for ever. See Richard Hooker, *Lawes of Ecclesiastical Polity* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of the Harvard UP, 1977ff.), V.6.2, p. 33f. All references to *Lawes* are taken from this critical edition. The simple phrase, “locally adapted” allows for the Body to differentiate, to be diverse in its parts, and yet grounded in “the historic episcopate.”

¹⁷ The significance of the shift from “*est*” to “*subsistit in*” in “*Lumen Gentium*, 1.8, is, again, worth noting. “*How*” at least implies that “Church” already exists in an ecclesial body, and so shifts the conversation away from “Is the Church present in this body?”. The conversation, then, begins on a deeper level of exploring a fundamental and mutual reality of each ecclesial body’s being already a part of the Body of Christ.

ecumenical dialogue between Anglicans and Orthodox no longer could be union, the dialogue should continue in order to exchange ideas and develop further understanding between Anglican and Orthodox. The result has been a thriving, rich, and immensely important conversation since then.¹⁸

However, this model or foundation for ecclesiology is not simply about ecumenical relations or a framework for exploring another ecclesial body. Our focus here is on The Episcopal Church, and the question is, “How does a Body of Christ ecclesiology provide a strong foundation for understanding who and what The Episcopal Church is?”

The Episcopal Church thinks of itself as a relational Church in which its structures and processes promote and enhance relationships among the people, congregations, and dioceses for the effective creation and sustaining of ministries of love and service in the world in the Name of Jesus. We think of ourselves as a democratic, participatory Church, especially with regard to decision-making. The structures and processes of The Episcopal Church function with a range of flexibility within the resulting dialectic of a hierarchical church and a democratically formed culture of participation. It is not infrequently untidy, unclear, and challenging on many levels. It is also frequently extraordinarily and profoundly amazing, life-giving, transforming, lively, and

¹⁸ The most recent public evidence of the substance of this on-going conversation was the publication of *The Church of the Triune God: The Cyprus Statement*, (London: The Anglican Communion Office, 2006). It was my privilege to serve on the International Commission for the Anglican Orthodox Theological Dialog from 2001-2007. When the issue is not, in some form, “How do we convince you to be like us?” there is an open, profound conversation that emerges and brings with it blessing, new insights, and new understandings that grow the “bonds of affection” grounded in Baptism between us.

faithful. The parts of this portion of the Body of Christ are profoundly diverse, ranging from the liturgically “high Church” to “low Church”; from the theologically Anglo-Catholic to Reformed Protestant; from the socially and politically liberal to the socially and politically conservative; we live and work in rural, suburban, and urban communities; there are among us multiple languages, ethnicities, and cultures. The content and texture of this part of Christ’s body are extraordinarily complex.

It is, I think, precisely these qualities of who we are that make St. Paul’s image powerfully appropriate as a foundation on which to build our theological self-understanding. It begins with the fact of many, complex, organically and systemically connected parts. It assumes that, whether we understand or not, whether we like it or not, all these parts have real, substantive, and necessary roles to play in making the whole who it is and shaping what we do as The Episcopal Church. It is a Church that believes and seeks to live in the reality of a remark attributed to Rowan Williams: through Baptism, we are knit together in relations not always of our choosing.¹⁹ A Body of Christ ecclesiology gives us a biblical and theological framework for understanding and engaging our diversity-in-unity as a gift of God through which God works and in which we participate in God’s Mission. This starting point grounds diversity and differentiation as of the *esse*, the very being, of the Church.

I am put in mind of an experience at a clergy conference that focused on African American church music traditions using *Lift*

¹⁹ See in this *Report*, Pierre Whalon, “The key to understanding The Episcopal Church”, p. 4, note 9.

Every Voice and Sing II (LEVAS) led by Horace C. Boyer.²⁰ He was trying to teach us how to sing hymns from *LEVAS*. He had made it clear that in the African American church music tradition, what was written on the page was regarded as mere suggestion. We were making a joyful noise when he stopped us, and after a pause, looked at us and said, “Children, I have never heard so much unison in all my life.” Pointed pause. “And children, God does not like unison. God wants to hear harmony. Now sing those parts!” The parts are distinct and give the music its depth, richness, and character. From time to time, unison has its place, as in plainsong chant. But the natural progression of music is to differentiation, to harmony.

This brings us back to the nature of unity. What St. Paul’s Body of Christ model tells us quite clearly is that the Church is naturally differentiated and diverse, both within each denomination and as the Church as a whole. What an ecclesiology built on this foundation must address is how the Church can be “one” (in unity) with the existing reality of denominations.²¹ The Pauline perspective disallows any one denomination to claim to

²⁰ Horace Boyer (1935 – 2009) was one of the foremost scholars in the field of Afro-American gospel music. He received his B.A. from Bethune-Cook College, and his M.A and Ph.D. from the Eastman School of Music. He and his brother sang professionally together in the 1950s. Boyer taught at various universities and colleges, did extensive research and writing, and edited a number of collections, including *LEVAS* (1993) for The Episcopal Church. He also conducted many choirs and conducted workshops and clinics. He introduced many communities to African-American gospel music. In 2009, he was awarded the prestigious Life-time Achievement Award from the Society for American Music.

²¹ “Denominations” in this context refers to all the ecclesial bodies within the Christian tradition. From this perspective, the Church catholic is at least the sum of all these parts, regardless of the actual or functional position of any one part.

be the whole,²² which in turn highlights the error of denominationalism that makes it divisive.²³ It is possible, I would argue, from the Pauline perspective of I Corinthians 12 and Romans 8, to see denominations as the natural result of maturation and differentiation, and differences of experiences in good faith within the Body of Christ that is a graced gift to and within the Church.²⁴ The fundamental question among the denominations shifts from “How do we convince the other to become like us, or how do we absorb the other into us?” to, “How do we learn to function faithfully together as the ‘one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church’ of which there is ‘one Lord, one faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all’?” The implications for ecumenical dialogues as well as collaborations in ministry at churchwide, diocesan, and parish levels are immense,

²² Again, the important distinction between “*is (es) the Church*” and “*subsists in (subsistit in)*” a particular ecclesial body (denomination).

²³ It is beyond the scope of this essay to go into a detailed examination of the classical contrasting philosophies of “unity” of Aristotle and Plato. It is worth noting that at the root of the conceptual problem that leads to the “problem” of denominationalism, is arguably whether one has a fundamentally Aristotelean or Platonic understanding of unity.

²⁴ To draw briefly a theological parallel, the so-called Christological and Trinitarian controversies of the early Patristic period are generally assumed to be bad things were people (maliciously) promoted errors as truth to do harm to the Church. But I think there is another understanding to be had at the theological level (bracketing some of the individual and collective behaviors that were indeed “bad”), and that is the process of developing what became embraced as “orthodox” Christology and Doctrine of God, reflect a natural (and necessary) course of theological development as the Church worked its way through the profound and complex questions in each of these theological categories. An option, which certainly is contrary to the theological life of the Anglican tradition is a simplistic fideism in which theological assertions are made and are uncritically accepted.

and hold great possibilities for deeper and more effective participation in God's Mission.

Part of the way forward implicit in a Body of Christ ecclesiology is derived from the intimacy inherent in a body. For the Church, this intimacy moves in two directions simultaneously: (1) intimacy with the Head, Jesus Christ, and (2) intimacy among the parts. This intimacy lives at the heart of the essential relationship among the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit and the beloved people of God. It is especially the mission of the Holy Spirit to enliven and sustain this relationship as God's self-gift in love.²⁵ The intimacy of this relationship is formally inaugurated through the Sacrament of Initiation: Baptism (washing), Anointing (Chrismation), and Feeding (Eucharist). Christ feeding us sacramentally in the Eucharist sustains the intimacy between God and us. The Head, Jesus Christ, knows²⁶ the Body as a whole and each part at the deepest level of its being, the kind of knowing we find, for example in Psalm 139, "O Lord, thou hast searched me and known me! ... For thou didst form my inward parts, thou didst knit me together in my mother's womb. ... Thou knowest me right well; my frame was not hidden from thee, when I was being made in secret, intricately wrought in the depths of the earth. Thy eyes beheld my unformed substance..." (verses.1, 13, 15, 16).²⁷

²⁵ See the liturgy for Holy Baptism, *Book of Common Prayer* (1979), 308 (Baptism), and p. 418 (Confirmation) Romans 8; I Cor. 12.1-11; Ephesians 4.4; John 3.34; 6.63; 14.26; 15.26; 16.13.

²⁶ English here lacks the subtlety of French, German, or Spanish that distinguish between knowing about something (e.g., today is Monday) and knowing in the sense of understanding (e.g., I know s/he is a fair person). In this instance, both sorts of knowing are relevant and important.

²⁷ *Book of Common Prayer* (1979), p. 794ff.

Likewise, the intimacy of the Father and the Son with the beloved is expressed in the language of indwelling, "Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father is in me? ... I will be in you and you in me."²⁸ Also, "If anyone loves me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our home with him."²⁹

The intimacy of the human being with God who is Holy Mystery, grows precisely as God unfailingly gives God's self to each person and each person chooses to receive that self-gift. We do not, of course, ever know God in the same way or with the completeness that God knows us. We do, however, come to know more and more fully and deeply Who God is and who we are as God's beloved. This intimacy takes us in the end to where there is no longer anything between us and God, and we know, like Job, that we behold our Redeemer, "and not as a stranger."³⁰ Yet this God-ward progression, so long as we live on earth, impels us both to know ourselves and the gifts and capacities God has given us, and thus to grow more consciously and fully into the *imago Dei*, the image of God. In so doing, each of us comes to be in the world in a more Godly manner, one that impels us to work to effect God's Mission through our living, working, and serving in the world in the Name of Jesus. Our lives come to be more and more incarnational of God's love. Hence, the Body of Christ becomes more and more clearly the image of God who embodies God's love in its life and work. The Church becomes more and more who it is.

²⁸ See Jn 14.10-11, 20.

²⁹ Jn 14.23.

³⁰ Job 19.25 – 27.

A sound ecclesiology holds both of these two essential aspects of intimacy, with Christ and with one another, within the Body of Christ in clear focus and as a dialectic reality within the Church. This biblical foundation means that each part of the body needs to know systemically both what its roles and functions are and what the roles and functions of the other parts of the Body are. Moreover, each part needs to know how its particular roles and functions work in relation to the whole Body, as well as the roles and functions of the other parts. Such knowledge deepens the appreciation for the diversity within the Body and increases respect for each part. The relationships among the parts become more real and concrete, building the capacity to understand and value one's self as well as the roles and functions of the others. Hence the Body is built up and its capacity to be the Body of Christ develops and deepens in quality, content, and effectiveness in the world.

Additionally, the knowledge of self and others as parts of a greater system, the Body of Christ, transforms the tension of difference into the dialectic of the creative relationship between independence and dependence, both of which are mutually powerful in shaping the parts and the whole. Hence, the Body of Christ, the Church, may be conceived of as a system in which the integrity of each part and the integrity of the whole are mutually and equally in an essential relation and relationship actualized as diversity-in-unity.

Christology as starting point: Jesus Christ the Ur-sakrament

Christology, or the study of who Christ is, provides us with another theological starting point for an ecclesiology. Beginning here means that one needs to have a clear and coherent

understanding of who, theologically, Jesus was and is, what Jesus did and does,³¹ and then draw clearly the lines from that point to the theology of the Church. Why God became human³² is the crucial question. If, for example, I think that the fundamental purpose of the incarnation was to save the world from sin so we could all go to heaven, then I have already set a tone and certain parameters around what the Church is and what the Church does, based on this interpretation of who Jesus was/is and what Jesus did/does. If I think that the primary reason for Jesus' incarnation is the fact of my sinfulness, I have declared a fundamental position with regard to both the Church and human beings that follows from my understanding of Jesus the Christ. Moreover, I have determined that the essential ministry of the Church is to "save" people so that they can go to heaven. Hence, the primary ministry of the Church would center on asking people the question, "Have you been saved?"³³ What does such a focus mean for the life and work of the Church?

On the other hand, what if we understand God's incarnation in Jesus as first and foremost an act of love? It is important to remember the theological principle in doctrine of God that Who God is and what God does are the same thing. Hence John wrote, "God is love."³⁴ What impact does it have to understand

³¹ John Macquarrie, *Jesus Christ in Modern Thought* (London and Philadelphia: SCM Press and Trinity Press International, 1990) 3, and *Christology Revisited* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity International Press, 1998). See also, Marcus Borg, *Speaking Christian*, (New York: Harper One, 2011), ch. 7, "Jesus".

³² Anselm of Canterbury, *Cur Deus homo*.

³³ See, for example, Marcus Borg, *Speaking Christian*, (New York: Harper One, 2011), chs. 1 and 2, and *passim*.

³⁴ 1Jn 4.8b.

incarnation as God's absolute free choice to give God's self to us in Jesus because that self-giving in love is the ultimate self-expression of "God is love"? What does it mean for our ecclesiology if the primary purpose of the incarnation, and then the Church, was to show us what divine love looks like so that we are more able, with God's help, to live and act as the image of God? What if divine mercy and forgiveness of sin is not about judgment and mercy, but about compassion and love to empower us by the Spirit to live in right relationship ("righteousness") with God, one another, and ourselves? What if the incarnation is God's proclamation that what is first true about us and finally true about us is not sin and brokenness, but wholeness and life lived with love and compassion in the Holy Spirit in and through the Church, the Body of Christ? These questions raise the possibility that the fundamental work of the Church is not to do what Jesus *did* as merely a matter of repetition and imitation. Rather we are to look deeply at the content of his life and work in order to determine how we can do the same in our day for and with God's beloved, who are, therefore, also *our beloved*.³⁵

What do these two different approaches and understandings mean for the way(s) in which the Gospel is proclaimed? What does it mean for the way(s) in which the Church, individually and corporately, engages the people around it and the world at large? In more specifically Episcopalian terms, what are the ramifications for our understanding and living the Baptismal Covenant?

When Jesus the Christ is the starting point of our ecclesiology, is it Jesus as person or Jesus as Christ or both; knowing about Jesus or knowing Jesus or both; simply my one-on-one individual

³⁵ See Borg, *Speaking Christian, passim*, but especially Chs. 1-3, 5-7, 10-15.

relationship with Jesus that matters or meeting Jesus in the household of faith? A Christological starting point requires of us to define whom or what the starting point, "Jesus," means. Who we think or believe that he is tells us who or what the Church is. Does the Church simply do what Jesus did, however we see or understand that? Or, does the Church interpret what Jesus did and discern in the Spirit how that works in the contemporary setting? Or, does the Church do some of both? What are the limits? What are the possibilities?

When doing ecclesiology from a Christological starting point, we must be careful not to claim that the Church is the "continuation" of the incarnation in space and time. The Incarnate One has ascended; he is no longer here. Christ is now the head of the Church, his Body.³⁶ The Church is not Christ. It is also important to remember that Paul's "Body of Christ" language is symbolic or analogous language, and not literal language. It does describe the relationship in which Christ is present and active in the Holy Spirit who gives life and power to the Church at the corporate and individual levels. From a Christological perspective, the Church in and with the Spirit, that is, "with God's help,"³⁷ continues the redeeming work of the Son. We do what Jesus did in our day, in our circumstances, among and with the people where we are in our ministries of love and service. We invite, as Jesus invites, God's people into a life-giving, creative relationship with God that makes it possible for us to become more and more transparently the image of God. To be the Body of Christ as who we are brings forward the icon, the sacramentality

³⁶ Cf. Ephesians 1.22; 4.15; Col. 1.18; 2.19.

³⁷ The Baptismal Covenant, *The Book of Common Prayer* (1979), pp. 305f.

of the human person and the Church, as natural to both. This sacramentality of the Church manifests in the ministries for which the Spirit equips and empowers us.

“Sacrament” AND “sacramentality”

Beginning with Christology also opens for us a consideration of the notions of “sacred,” “holy,” “mystery,” and the Church as sacrament,³⁸ as well as the implications of Jesus the Christ as Son of God (divine) and as son of Mary (human). Sacramentality, then, can be understood as a capacity to bear God’s self-gift in the world in concrete, specific ways as well as more generally. That is, the world is the context of God’s self-gift in love (= grace), to

³⁸ “Sacramentality” and “sacrament” represent an important theological distinction. Sacramentality is the more general term which refers to a natural or inherent quality of the created order. It is the condition of possibility for the specific sacraments of the Church. Sacramentality, then refers to the capacity of the created order as a whole, and in its parts, to bear God’s grace. That is, the created order and its parts have the capacity to be instruments or vehicles through which God makes God’s Self known in the world. The world, then, is inherently revelatory, as and when God chooses, in general, and in the specific sacraments of the Church. It is the inherent sacramentality of bread and wine that make it possible for them to be the sacramental Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist. All Churches, at this point, agree there are at least two sacraments, the so-called Dominical Sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist. See Edward Schillebeeckx, *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1987). This classic work provides a penetrating examination of the relationship among Christ, sacrament, and Church. In this study, Schillebeeckx makes the distinction in the relationship in this way: Christ is the *Ur-sakrament* from and in whom there is the Church, the *primary sacrament* which is the context and instrument of the *sacraments* (including at least Baptism and Eucharist). Schillebeeckx’s sacramental worldview and theology resonates well with the sacramental perspective and theology of Richard Hooker in *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (I.2.2 and V.50, 55, 56.2, 5-7, 57-58), as well as the theology of Karl Rahner on Church, sacraments, and the world. See, for example, Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations IV*, Part 1.2, pp. 36-76; and, Part V, The Sacraments. *The Church and the Sacraments*, (Freiburg: Herder and London: Burns and Oates, 1963).

creation, is also God's self-revelation. In this sense, we may understand sacramentality as an essential characteristic of the nature of the created order that reflects God's will and capacity to self-disclosure in relation to the created order in general and in relationship with human beings in particular.

Christology also brings us to some of the thornier questions, especially at ecumenical and interfaith levels, such as the concept, "Outside the church there is no salvation." Beginning from Christology situates us in a theological richness that bears considerable thought, particularly in light of this theological principle. There is even further compelling need to think theologically about this claim when coupled with Jesus' statement, "No one comes to the Father except through me."³⁹ As Macquarrie points out in his compelling final chapter of *Jesus Christ in Modern Thought*, our day demands a very careful reading and interpretation of two statements too often and too quickly read in a literal and utterly facile manner under the rubric of the "plain meaning of the text." The result, simply put, renders a grossly inadequate theology of Christ and the Church that is narrow, exclusive, and judgmental. It also avoids the complex and sometimes difficult work of thinking about these statements and what they say to us about how we build an appropriate, life-giving, and theologically sound Christology and ecclesiology for our day. From Macquarrie's perspective, Christians may claim that in Jesus we see the definitive revelation of God's Self and God's purposes for humanity and creation, which, in turn, are explicitly expressed in and through the Church. However, Christians may not legitimately claim that in Jesus is the exclusive

³⁹ John 14.6. On this topic, see the very helpful final chapter of John Macquarrie, *Jesus Christ in Modern Thought*, ch. 20.

revelation of God's Self and purposes for humanity and creation. Nor, can we claim legitimately "*non salus extra ecclesiam*" – "outside the Church there is no salvation."⁴⁰

As we look at who and what the Church is from a Christological perspective, we also encounter the theological task of thinking about how our experiences as humans have grown and developed and changed over the centuries. A much, much larger knowledge base now challenges the ways in which we think about Christ and the Church, how we understand who and what it is, and how our knowledge and understanding shapes the life and work of the Church. Hegel's "ugly ditch"⁴¹ between the present and past can serve as a helpful concept.⁴² The question

⁴⁰ This ancient phrase, as alluded to, has implications for both ecumenical and interfaith relations. A major problem on the ecumenical front has always been the claim of the Church of Rome to be exclusively the true Church. The shift in *Lumen gentium* of Vatican II was of major importance, though John Paul II and Benedict XVI did everything they could to nullify the shift back to the old exclusivism. The change in language from "the Church is the Roman Catholic Church," to "the Church *subsists in*" allowed for legitimate ecclesial bodies other than the Roman Church that shifted the relationship, in John XXIII's language to "separated brethren." The same problem exists in relationship to the Orthodox Churches, who still maintain that the fullness of the Church is (and can) be only in the Orthodox Church. On the interfaith front, the question is, "How does God's redemptive love and plan become expressed and known in other of the world's religions?" It will not do, I think, to avoid this question (as if we could) by simply hiding in the ancient axiom.

⁴¹ An introduction to this concept in Hegel's thought is here: *The Oxford Handbook of Theology and Modern European Thought*, eds. Nicholas Adams, George Pattison, Graham Ward (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 588

⁴² See Hooker, *Lawes* V.19.1-3. Hooker's discussion about the interpretation and understanding of Scripture articulates a remarkable understanding of history and language for the 16th century. Hooker is critiquing the puritan position of insisting on the "plane meaning" of a text as the only possible meaning, and that it then must be applied literally. Hooker makes two charges. First the position of the puritans ignores the reality of the effects of the passage of time, that is

may be put this way, “What is the difference between now and then? How does this difference impact our capacity to understand or interpret a statement, and then apply it in our own day?”

The incarnation of God, Jesus, stands, among many things, as the primary example of the sacramentality of the created order. Jesus is God’s own demonstration of the capacity of the created order to bear God’s grace into the created order, precisely through the sacramentality of his humanness that bears God’s grace in the world most fully in the created order.⁴³

In the sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist, we know and experience the capacity of created elements—water, bread, and wine—to bear God’s grace as these sacraments initiate us into the Body of Christ and sustain us as Christ’s Body precisely as the Church. As that Body through which the sacraments are given, we

history. Secondly, they wrongly assume that the passage of time has no effect on the meaning of words or the capacity of a latter period to grasp the original meanings and subtleties of historic language. Foreshadowing Hegel, Hooker concludes that an historical text cannot simply be moved across centuries and read in a latter century without consideration of the effects of history and human experience on the language and capacity to grasp it entirely. There is what Hegel would later call “an ugly ditch” between the present and past that is insurmountable. See also, *Lawes* V.20.4 for a sense of Hooker’s understanding and appreciation of change and development within history in general, and the Church in particular.

⁴³ Let me be clear at this point that here I am only addressing the inherent sacramentality of humans in general. I am not casting doubts, implicitly or explicitly, on the unique perichoretic being of Jesus as fully God and fully human. This perichoresis of divine and human could only be possible and real if both realities were, *in se*, real. For Jesus to be fully human and fully divine, human being as embodied reality (“embodied spirit,” to use Aquinas’ language), there has to be an inherent capacity of human being to bear God’s grace, which becomes the condition of possibility for God to take that human being and speak it into the created order as God’s Self incarnate.

know and experience the Church as the primary sacrament of the *Ur-sakrament*, Jesus the Christ.⁴⁴

Extending this line of argument can take us to an understanding of the individual Christian as well as the life and work of the Church. We, who are the Church, bear, by virtue of Baptism, a vocation to live in ways that most fully support, enhance, and demonstrate our sacramentality in who we are and the works we do. The Christological context of our ecclesiology calls the Church as institution and each of us to living with a sacramental mindfulness of ourselves, of the Church, and of what we do or do not do each day precisely as both image of God and as Body of Christ. In each part of the Body is the whole. The sacramentality of each part and of the whole identifies the vocation of the Church and each of its parts to bear God's grace, as the presence, love, and work of the Father through the Son in the Spirit. Just as the primordial sacrament, Jesus, is part and yet bears the whole of God, so each member of the Body of Christ bears the whole of the primary sacrament, the Church, into the world by living in the world in the same manner as God lives with us. God is the steadfast being-present-in-love that gives and

⁴⁴*Ur-sakrament* is a German term applied to Jesus the Christ as the "primordial, original, basic or first sacrament" in the sense that he is the primary expression of God's Self, presence, and action from which the Church and sacraments derive. Hereafter, "primordial sacrament." Ecclesiology needs to be careful not to claim too much when speaking of the Church as sacrament. We know that inasmuch as the created order has an inherent sacramentality, sacraments are not the *exclusive* bearers of God's grace in the world. Nor is the Church *qua* primary sacrament the exclusive bearer of God's grace. It may reasonably be argued theologically, and particularly in the context of ecclesiology, that the sacraments and the Church as primary sacrament are the clearest, most intense, and definitive bearers of God's grace, in specific moments and events, understanding that grace is God's self-gift in love to us. This distinction is the parallel form in sacramental theology of the ecclesiological dilemma of "*non salus extra ecclesiam*".

sustains life through our participation in God's mission in our ministries.⁴⁵

Beginning with the Dominical Sacraments

The Christological starting point opens naturally into another point of departure for ecclesiology, moving us from Christ the primordial sacrament to a sacramental approach to ecclesiology. This one is particularly pertinent to The Episcopal Church in light of the *Book of Common Prayer* (1979). Developing an ecclesiology beginning from Baptism and Eucharist has been what The Episcopal Church has done over the last 40 years. The stimulus for such thinking about the Church derives primarily from our emphasis on the Baptismal Covenant, as well as developments in the theology and practice of ministry for both ordained and laypersons. Our understanding of Church is profoundly shaped by our understanding of what it means to be a baptized person and to participate in the Eucharist. The theological emphasis has become, generally speaking, on the Church as "missional," as that Body who, under the guidance of the Spirit, exists to do ministries in the world in the Name of Jesus. In this understanding, the work of the Church becomes the means of participation in God's Mission in which God acts. This work, and those who do it, are,

⁴⁵ In the tradition, we can well remember the insight of St. Thomas Aquinas in his discussion of the sacrament. Aquinas argues that the sacramental elements of bread and wine for one, unified sacramental symbol: the-Body-and-Blood-of-Christ. Therefore, to receive any *part* of the whole is to receive the *whole*. Therefore, the faithful were not being deprived of the whole (or fullness) of the Sacrament because of the practice of only receiving the Bread/Body. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra gentiles*, IV.61 – 69; see also, *Summa Theologica* III, Q lxxx, a.12, ad 3; Bonaventure, *Sentences*, IV, XI, punt. li, a.1, q.2; Cajetan III.q.33; Francisco Suarez, Q.III,q.lxxix, a.8, disp lxiii, IV, 8, sq; Robert Bellarmine, *De Sac. Euch.* IV.2; and others.

therefore, sacramental: bearers in concrete ways of God's grace. There is here an overlap with an ecclesiology grounded in Christology. We return to pull through the thread of Jesus as primordial sacrament, and the Church as primary sacrament, in order to explicate further an understanding and practice of Church that grows out of Baptism and Eucharist. The sacramental perspective also pulls forward again the ecclesiology of the Body of Christ as linked with the Eucharist by which God continues to feed the Church to be the Body of Christ.

Extrapolating from Hooker's understanding of the structures of the created order as possessing an inherent sacramentality, a sacramental approach to ecclesiology links the Church, as such, even more intimately to the created order precisely as institution and people through whom God works. We are reminded that we are *created* to participate in God's Mission, which is to be both a people and an organization that embodies God's love. Moreover, we are to be icons of God as we live in ways that demonstrate the meaning of being created in the image and likeness of God. Our natural sacramentality is the condition of possibility for us to be bearers of God's grace in real, concrete ways that in themselves also possess a natural sacramentality. We are to do what God does, especially as demonstrated in the sacraments: to embody God's love, and thus to sustain and enhance life through our lives and works.

Therefore, we may understand the sacraments both as ways through which God comes to us, and as models of how we are to be and live in the world as individuals and as Church. When we begin to consider the Church sacramentally, we enter into a world of symbol and ritual, a world of icon, and a world through which God comes to us. The caveat here is, of course, not to allow

ourselves to become lost in abstractions or confuse the symbols and rituals with God. Indeed, to think that the world of sacraments, symbols, and rituals is mere abstraction is to miss the very nature and purpose of sacraments entirely.

The notion of sacramentality denotes a natural quality of the created order in general. That is, it does not indicate specific sacraments nor specific sacramental qualities, events, or material. It is of the *esse* (essence) of the created order, identifying the capacity of the created order to be a means through which God's presence and activity occur.⁴⁶ A sacrament identifies specific, material qualities and events in which the faithful experience, through symbols and rituals, specific, explicit, intense moments of God's engagement with us and we with God. These events mark fundamental major events in our life. The Dominical sacraments: Baptism, our naming and formal incorporation into the Body of Christ; Eucharist, through which the Risen Christ continue to feed us with Christ's Body and Blood to participate in God's Mission by living our Baptismal Vows; and the other five sacraments.⁴⁷ Each of these marks specific critical moments in human life: Marriage, sickness and healing and dying (Unction or Anointing), Ordination, Reconciliation (confession and absolution), and Confirmation. In each case, the Church marks in a liturgical,

⁴⁶ See Richard Hooker, *Laws*, 1.1-3,5-8.

⁴⁷ Within the Anglican Tradition, the number of sacraments generally depends on where along the spectrum of Anglicanism one sits theologically and liturgically. The Evangelical segment sees two sacraments, Baptism and Eucharist. This position is consistent with Article XXV of the Thirty-nine Articles (*Book of Common Prayer* [1979], p. 872). The Anglo-Catholic portion of Anglicanism recognizes "Those five commonly called sacraments" (Art. XXV) as sacraments in their own right. The theological debate in the matter is beyond the scope of this essay, but to avoid confusion, the matter is here tagged.

ritualized, and symbolic way, particular moments when we ask God to be present in an explicit and intense way for us and with us in the context of the Church.⁴⁸ The ritual and symbol of the liturgy mark in a formal way both an affirmation that God is present and active in this moment and that we receive God's blessing to bring to fruition the intention and focus of this particular moment or event.

So, what does this provide for us in terms of thinking theologically about the Church? If we think of the Church as primary sacrament of the primordial sacrament, we can think of the Church as that body of persons who are keenly aware of and connected to God and to the deepest, most holy, and most concrete dimensions of the created order. We are, both by nature and grace, collectively and individually, what the Celtic tradition calls a "thin place". The Church sees and acts, as institution and as individual members, as God sees us and acts toward us. This seeing and acting on the part of God culminates in the incarnation of the Son, Jesus. To be sacrament and act sacramentally in the world is to be, to see, and to act with mindfulness of our primary connection to God and that sacraments are ways in which Holy Mystery becomes real, concrete, accessible, present, and effectively active within the world with people. Hence, our lives

⁴⁸ It is appropriate to remember that in the Anglican Tradition, sacraments are always "public" celebrations. That is, they are *of* and *by* the Church as *community* of faith, and not private matters. Two examples: From the beginning, the Book of Common Prayer has required that at least one other person be present with the priest in order to celebrate the Eucharist. Especially since the adoption of the Book of Common Prayer (1979), the baptismal liturgy makes it very clear that the former tradition found in many parishes of "private Baptism" is, at best inappropriate, and, except *in extremis*, is not to be done. Indeed, "private Baptism" is a liturgical, theological, and sacramental contradiction of terms.

in all their dimensions are to be embodiments of love: curators of the created order, personal giving of self to the other, and sustaining of the inherent connectedness of all the parts of the created order. The Church and all its parts are to reflect in their lives the love, orderliness, focus, generativity, and commitment of God toward us and the created order as a whole as individuals and as Church.

A sacramental ecclesiology, therefore, both connects us constantly and mindfully to the world and to the One Who is our ground and source. Moreover, a sacramental ecclesiology reminds us that who we are, what we do, the means we use, and the ways in which we live and work all have a sacramental dimension that is real and concrete. We can never think of ourselves, of the Church, of others, or the world without a robust understanding of our sacramentality and hence of the holiness of our living and working in the world.

Trinity as Starting Point

The Doctrine of God as Trinity may seem a complex and dubious starting point for an ecclesiology. However, I think that it provides us with a rich starting point which, like the others in this essay, both keep us grounded and build a strong, comprehensive, and accessible way of understanding who and what the Church is.⁴⁹ In the Christian tradition, there are two predominant classical models for understanding Trinity: the Augustinian “psychological model”⁵⁰ (especially in the West) and the Greek Patristic model

⁴⁹ This is not the place to argue the cases about the classical language of Trinitarian theology. I am going to use the classical language, “Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,” because it is most familiar.

⁵⁰ See Augustine’s *De Trinitate*. XV.17-19, and also I.4-7; II.3-5, 8; IV 20, 21; V.8-10;

(especially in the East).⁵¹ Both models offer important insights for an ecclesiology.

The fundamental difference between the two models is the dynamic and direction of their focus. Augustine's model is more focused on God's internal life and the over-abundance of love which "spills over" into the created order. The Greek model is an "ecstatic" model in which God chooses in absolute freedom to give God's Self in love into the created order, especially to God's beloved children.

The Augustinian model addresses the superabundance of love which God is. Within God, there is an eternal exchange of love among the Three Persons of Trinity. There is here, I think, a theological explication of the simple statement of I John 4.8b, "God is love." Love is explained in terms of a dynamic self-giving of each Person of the Godhead that is constant and timeless. What the Persons of the Godhead do is love each other by giving themselves to each other. What they give is personal, that is, themselves. Theologically, then, within the Godhead, Who God is and what God does are the same thing. Hence, to say, "God is love" and "God loves" has the same meaning. In Augustine's image, it overflows toward and into the created order. It is in this overflow that humans experience God and know that God is love (Romans 5:5). The ultimate expression of this superabundance of love overflowing into the created order is in its embodiment in Jesus. Jesus then is the embodied love of God (the Son) and is both really and fully human as well as really and fully divine.

VI.3-7; VIII.4-10; IX.1-5. This profound work is a seminal theology of God and provides a fulsome development of Augustine's thinking about God.

⁵¹ Cf. Patristic Fathers, especially the Cappadocian Fathers writings on Trinity and John Damascene, *De Fide Orthodoxa*. See also John Zizioulas, n. 10 above.

This very brief and simplified explanation of Augustine's theology of God does provide a framework that is helpful for developing an ecclesiology. First, and arguably most fundamentally, because God is love and the Church is the Body of Christ, the deepest essential reality of the Church is that it, too, is love. Therefore, it is also of the deepest essence of the Church that what it does is love. The nature and quality of this love is dynamic, eternal, and superabundant. As Christ embodied God's love within the created order, so also the Church, as Body of Christ, is to embody God's love within the created order out of the superabundance of love that is the internal being and doing of the Church.

Within the Church, the people of God (the baptized), each person is created in the image of God. At the very heart of human essence is this divine image. Through Baptism and the indwelling of the Spirit, we are empowered to live as the image of God and so be bearers of God's grace (God's self-gift in love). As bearers of God's grace, we carry into the world this divine love. In Augustinian terms, we receive and accept the superabundance of God's love and, in this openness to God, that love flows through us into the world and to others. But this is not all. The image of God within us, enlivened by the Spirit, reveals to us that it is of our very nature to be and act like God. That is, we are created to love as God loves: it is who we truly are and what we are to do.

Yet, we know all too painfully, that, with great creativity, persistence, and effectiveness, we often do not love. We do not love God, ourselves, or anyone else. We sin, living out the shadow side of the gift of free will. And yet, here we also encounter the superabundance of God's love through confession, forgiveness, and reconciliation, whether sacramentally or less formally in our

conversations with God and our engagements with one another. The explicit acts of confession, forgiveness, and reconciliation are acts of love that re-create and renew our capacity to love. Because the people of God are created in the image and likeness of Love and empowered by the Spirit to be and do this love, it is then true that the Church, including the institution, are to be individuals and a body who love. This love is no abstraction or sentiment: its expressions are real, concrete, and practical. And this comes about especially through confession, forgiveness, and reconciliation.

Augustine's model is personal – not *about* God, but *of* God. The essence of the Church is love, both as it is the Body of Christ and as the people of God who are made in the image of God. God's love within the Church and within each person is in a superabundance which, as with God to us, so we to the world. We are to receive and let flow through us this superabundance, not in the abstract, but through us and through the ministries we as the Church do in the world. Moreover, as God is eternal and the superabundance of God's love is eternal, the capacity of the people of God as individuals and as Church to love is unlimited by space and time. From an Episcopalian perspective, the ways we learn and live and embody this reality is precisely in our embracing and committing ourselves, singly and together, to live daily our Baptismal Vows.

The Greek model of Trinity places its emphasis on the ecstatic nature of God. The Greek word, *εκστασις*, commonly translated as "ecstasy", means "to go or stand out of."⁵² To describe God as

⁵² The usual meaning of "ecstasy" is an experience of rapture, of being transported out of one's self. Here it means God's going out of God's Self in love to the created order. This *ekstasis* is the way God creates, sustains, and redeems. This model is not about "superabundance" but emphasizes the nature of God to

“ecstatic” is to identify the fundamental dynamic and character of God’s self-revelation. It is God’s free choice to be in relationship with the created order in general and with human beings in particular, precisely by going out of God’s Self to us. Again, “grace” here is understood as God’s self-gift in love. The difference here, in contrast to the Augustinian model is that the decision for *ekstasis* is not secondary, the product of an overflow or superabundance of love. It is a primary decision of God to be in relationship with the created order, especially human beings, in a particular way, as revealed in God’s self-revelation.⁵³

What we find especially in the Greek model is an understanding of love as personal, dynamic, and always moving outward into embodiment. As with Augustine, the ultimate embodiment of God’s *ekstasis* is Jesus. The ecstatic nature of God’s love was embodied and lived in the life and ministry of Jesus. The ministry of Jesus was a ministry of “going out” and giving himself to the other. Jesus also demonstrates in his own life that the *ekstasis* of God is a disciplined and timely activity. Love does not simply go careening hither and yon throughout the created order.⁵⁴ One of the central points of both creation stories in

give God’s self to creation in general and God’s beloved in particular as the essential quality of who God is and what God does. To make this distinction, the word “ekstasis” shall be used.

⁵³ See Richard Hooker, *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, I.2 Hooker’s discussion of the Second Law Eternal is germane here. Hooker, building on Aquinas, created what he called “The Second Law Eternal” to describe theologically the self-revelation of God. The Second Law Eternal is the revelation by God of how God *in se* has chosen to relate to and be with the world, especially human beings. The influence of both classical Greek sources as well as Greek Patristic sources is evident. The presence of St. Augustine’s theology is also present. Hooker weaves his secondary sources and their perspectives with a clear biblical grounding.

⁵⁴ See, for example, the story of Zacchaeus, Luke 19.1-7; and, the healing of

Genesis is that God is a God of order.⁵⁵ This intentional, disciplined self-giving culminates in the final act of the crucifixion of Jesus. Yet, actually, the crucifixion is not the ultimate act in God's decision of redemption for us by God's self-gift in love. The crucifixion is prelude to the resurrection, which is prelude to Pentecost. The redemption of the world is effected through God's self-gift, each Person of Trinity having its particular mission in the whole process.⁵⁶

Additionally, we see in Jesus and in his life that the going out into the world has two other dimensions: (1) a keen sense of *καιρος*, the "right time", and (2) the necessity of preparation and continuous living in intentional relationship with God. More than once Jesus says, "My time has not yet come". He had a deep sense

Jairus' daughter, Mark 5.17-27; Luke 8.36-46.

⁵⁵ Genesis 1 – 2.

⁵⁶ While I think we can say that God put God's whole Self into the redemption of the world, and that the work of redemption is the work of all three Persons, we must be careful not to imply that the process of redemption exhausts the revelation of God's Self to us. As much as God is love, God is also, as Karl Rahner often termed it, Holy Mystery. The revelation of God is always qualified by God's choices known in revelation and the fact that God is and remains absolute mystery – infinite and eternal, never completely knowable by finite humans. The Greek Fathers spoke of our final union with God and the Latin and Medieval Fathers spoke of the beatific vision. In both cases, there has always been clarity that when we die, it will be as Job declared: "and though this body be destroyed, yet shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself and my eyes shall behold, and not as a stranger" (Job 19.25-27, *Book of Common Prayer*, The Burial of the Dead, p. 469), that union with God is not a dissolution of our finite self into God. Rather it is the ultimate experience of the absolute difference between God and ourselves: God is eternally God and we are eternally ourselves. And in that reality, we enter the "lightsome darkness" the light so bright, intense, and pure that we actually "see" (know) nothing, yet see (know) everything that finally matters – we are with God and there is nothing between us. We have entered into the mansion prepared for us.

of when it was time to do certain things and when it was not. Doing things “out of time” would be contrary to the will of the Father Who “had sent” him into the world to do specific work. We see in Jesus both the discipline of restraint and of going forward. Both of these qualities mark his sense of *kairos* (timeliness), discipline, and obedience to the Father. He never simply goes willy-nilly into the world and peoples’ lives. Secondly, he was a man of prayer. We see this especially in the Gospel according to Luke. Jesus went off alone to care for his heart and soul in conversation with the Father and the Spirit. In a sense, we can think of this conversation much in the same way as the implied conversation within God’s Self about the creation of humanity.⁵⁷

From this brief discussion of the Greek Patristic model, the suggestions for an ecclesiology include these theological points: The Church, as the Body of Christ, and each part of the Body, is ecstatic. This essential *ekstasis* reflects both the nature of God’s love and the dynamic of God’s life as revealed in the created order. An essential dynamic of the Church is, therefore to be ecstatic. The *ekstasis* of the Church takes the forms of its participation in the world and the ministries it does in the Name of Jesus.

The life and work of Jesus remind us that God’s work, and therefore, our participation as the Body of Christ in that work, is ordered and disciplined. This participation functions in obedience to our hearing of God’s call to us, and in using the gifts given us to accomplish that work. Insofar as the *ekstasis* of both members and Body as a whole are faithful to God, then, with the indwelling of the Spirit, we participate in God’s Mission, demonstrating the

⁵⁷ Genesis 1.26-27. Note especially the “Let us make...”

truth of God's proclamation, "So it is my word goes forth from my mouth, it will not return to me empty/, But it will accomplish that for which I purposed, and prosper in that for which I sent it."⁵⁸ Participating in God's *ekstasis* through our own *ekstasis* must also reflect Jesus' same mindfulness of *kairos*. Timeliness and effectiveness go hand in hand. And, perhaps most importantly, the life and work of Jesus remind us that participation in God's *ekstasis* lives in and out of the radical relationship we have with the Father in the Son through the Spirit. This relationship is fueled by formation, training, and prayer, under the guidance of the Spirit.

This dimension of beginning with Trinity to shape our ecclesiology grows out of both a sense of *kairos* and of our living our lives based on the ways God is for us and with us. Jesus shows us clearly that the relationship between the Father and him was intentional, prayerful, and disciplined. It was not secondary or optional. Therefore, for us individually, and for us together as the Church, life-giving conversation, formation of heart, mind, and soul through careful attention to the Spirit within us, and developing knowledge and skills are necessary for us to be able to hear and respond to the work God gives to us individually and to the Church. God as Trinity is a community of persons who live and work in the greatest possible intimacy. Trinity is an *us*, and therefore is one, in complete and absolute unity. As finite and sinful creatures, our functioning and our unity is always qualified by our choices to respond or not to God's invitation. We are always a mixture of righteousness and unrighteousness. Nonetheless, *the model* of the life of God in God's self, insofar as

⁵⁸ Isaiah 55.11

we can extrapolate that life from God's self-revelation, is the primary way we, as individuals and as the Body of Christ, come most fully to be and do precisely that in our life and work in a manner that is intimate, personal, balanced, and effective.

Developing an ecclesiology from a Trinitarian perspective makes it possible to understand the Church at least in these ways:

The Church is a "who," not an "it."⁵⁹ That is, the personal nature of the Church as a whole and in its parts (the people of God) is brought forward. From this perspective, the structures and processes of the Church as institution are set within a context of relationships grounded in the interior relationships among the Persons of the Trinity. We know these relationships insofar as God reveals them to us.

The proper ordering of the life and work of the Church, therefore, is always for living an *ecstatic* life in love that clearly bears God's grace in the world through its prayer and worship, and through generative, effective ministries in service to God's mission. The Church is truly itself when who we are and what we do are the same. This essential unity of being and doing in the Church reflects the actual essential unity within the Godhead as well as the *ecstatic* dynamic of God, the personal giving of self in love. The Church embodies this love, precisely as the individual and corporate image and likeness of God who is love. The Church, therefore, is also to be seen as symbol and instrument through which God is present and acts in the world.

Trinity demonstrates to us the fundamental way we are created and called to participate in God's Mission. Our life is to be participatory, reflecting the participatory life of Trinity. Trinity

⁵⁹ Cf. Martin Buber, *I and Thou*. Trans. Ronald Gregor Smith (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1986)

makes clear that life with the Father in the Son through the Spirit is relational among persons. It is in this personal participation that we come to the core of what it is to be human, through which we draw most closely to God, and by which we most fully participate in God's Mission.

Beginning with our understanding of Trinity also opens for us a platform from which to connect other starting points: the Church as sacrament or the Church as Body of Christ. The common thread is each perspective focuses on God and derives from our understanding of God.

Concluding Remarks

In this essay, I have offered a basic definition of ecclesiology. I articulated briefly several starting points from which we can understand the Church. In this process, I have also given some indication of the natural inter-relatedness among these starting points.

Beginning with a biblical starting point, St. Paul's Body of Christ model of 1 Corinthians, we have looked at Christology, sacramental theology, and Trinity. There are others. One does well to look at Avery Dulles' classic, *Models of the Church*, for still other possibilities.⁶⁰ As Dulles rightly argues, models (or here, starting points) do not and cannot be exhaustive, nor are they properly understood as the single definitive expression of who the Church is. They are only particular lenses that focus our attention or

⁶⁰ Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church*, New York: Image Classics, 1991).

Additional possibilities are found in the documents of Vatican II, especially *Lumen gentium*, *Dei verbum*, *Unitatis redintegratio*, as well as *Apostolicam acuositatum* (on the laity) *Christus Dominus* (on bishops), *Optatum Totius* (priestly formation), *Presbyteriorum ordinis* (on the ministry and life of priests).

thinking. They are not comprehensive in and of themselves. They are suggestive, provocative, evocative. Models are devices, much like a literary device, to engage our intellect, imagination, and creativity in disciplined, thoughtful, and faithful ways. Therefore, theologically, there really is no such thing as a single, comprehensive, exhaustive, and exclusive "ecclesiology." The reality is that there are, rightly and always, "ecclesiologies," which when taken as a whole, give us a broad and more comprehensive theological understanding of the Church.⁶¹

Models also are, by nature, articulations of the ideal. As ideals, they create tensions between the possibilities we imagine and the realities that we see and experience concretely in daily living. The ideal and the actual seem for us, at many levels, contradictory. This dilemma seems to be an inescapable dialectic, and therefore at least briefly needs commenting.

We can see clear relationships among Christological, sacramental, and Body of Christ ecclesiologies. These three perspectives deepen the understanding both theologically and practically what it means to be the Body and Christ and what it means to be a part of the Body of Christ, both institutionally and individually. The interrelation among these starting points is important to note methodologically for at least two reasons. First, the interconnection points up clearly that no one perspective, as comprehensive as it may be, is complete or absolute in itself. Secondly, and related to the first, is that regardless of where we start, we shall necessarily encounter and need to address other

⁶¹ Analogously, the same may be argued of the Gospels. Each gives us a perspective, portrait, and understanding of who Jesus was and what he did. When taken all together, the four Gospels give us a fuller, more comprehensive portrait as well as perspectives and understandings.

possible models at some point and in some way, even while the focus may remain on a particular starting point or particular perspectives. In a sense, then, it does not really matter where we start. Any given starting point will take us to multiple other starting points and possible perspectives. The caution in the discipline of theology in general, and ecclesiology in particular, is that we be always open to where the discipline takes us, both in terms of sources and perspectives. The basic principle here is that the doing of theology is not simply about “proving the point” with which we began. It is also, necessarily and equally, following the logic and evidence of our thinking, praying, and discerning. Faithfully allowing room for the Spirit to move within us will lead to places we had not intended or even thought of at the outset. Therein lies the challenge and liveliness of the discipline.

The Ideal and the Actual: A Proverbial Dilemma

Ecclesiology cannot simply examine and explicate the theological ideal of the Church, though the primary task is to do precisely that. A balanced ecclesiology addresses both the theological ideal and the “on-the-ground” realities of who the Church is and how it actualizes itself internally and in the world. A sound starting point will also provide opportunity for the Church to be self-critical, holding itself accountable and responsible internally and externally for its life and work. The theological ideal and the reality of practice create and maintain a dialectic that enlivens and challenges us. In this dialectic, there is always a gap, a difference, which is a product of the sin of God’s people and the sin of the Church. This gap is not simply a matter of hypocrisy, though at times it is certainly that. Even with God’s help, human beings individually and institutionally continue to

choose not-God, to turn away from God, to break right relationship with God, ourselves, and one another. It is precisely within the context of this truth about ourselves that the theological and practical question of how we are created and called to be becomes so crucial. In these moments we experience and know the dialectic between the whole and the broken. Here, the tension between the ideal and the actual stands as judgment and, even more importantly, it stands as call and invitation to remember who we are and Whose we are. The dialectic is the invitation to repent, in the sense of choosing again to turn Godward and be received again by God with compassion and love. It is the invitation to turn again to one another and ourselves with the same compassion and love. The image of the Church as Body of Christ, and of ourselves as Image of God, reminds us of the possibilities of the abundant life that is God's will for us, as well as the vows we have made (and renewed) through Baptism. It reminds us of why continuing in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship, the breaking of Bread, and the prayers is important, indeed essential, on a daily basis as well as in the weekly gathering for Eucharist.⁶² A proper ecclesiology of the Church must remind us of the dailyness of our living the faith, not as mere theory, but as the substance of engaging practically the world around us. This commitment to living as the Church is the essence of the Baptismal Covenant. It is what it means to "be raised to the new life of grace" which we live, "with God's help."⁶³

⁶² The Baptismal Covenant, *Book of Common Prayer* (1979) 304, referencing Acts 2:42.

⁶³ *BCP*, p. 304 and p. 308.

The Church is not called to be perfect. The Church is called to be faithful. The Church is called to strive, with God's help, to do and be fully its true self, to participate in God's Mission through effective ministries, to bear God's grace in the world, and to repent and seek God's forgiveness when we fail to do so. The Church is called to live within the realities of our humanness, and yet, in the Spirit, hold fast to the vision, the mission, and the God who created us, loves us, and who redeems us—this God, whom at the last, we shall behold, and not as a stranger. An essential part of our faithful response to God is disciplined thinking about who we are individually and as Church. Being the Church is hard work and daily work. And with God's help, it is do-able work.

Proto-Conciliarism in Acts 15

C. K. ROBERTSON

Midway through the Acts of the Apostles, in chapter 15, we find a fascinating tableau of the Church responding to conflict with conversation and compromise. While it might be overly simplistic to speak of the gathering in Jerusalem as a church council in the modern sense, certainly there we can find helpful information and even inspiration for us today as we approach divisive issues.

Following a series of tales of opposition to Barnabas and Paul's evangelistic inclusion of Gentiles, Acts 15 presents a different—less violent but no less virulent—picture of conflict. At the start of the chapter, the missionary duo faces formidable opponents in a group best known as "Judaizers," Jewish followers of Jesus who believed that Gentile converts could not truly be saved unless they went further and were circumcised, thereby becoming faithful, Torah-adherent Jews.¹ Today's Christians, the vast majority of whom are non-Jews, might not be able to appreciate fully the magnitude of this particular conflict, although variations on the theme of inclusion have been evident

¹ Acts 15:1

throughout the centuries. There were some who feared that something precious would be lost if these Gentile newcomers were integrated into the Christian community without honoring the long-held traditions and identity markers of the Chosen People of God. Circumcision, and the life of faithful adherence to the Law of Moses to which the crucial rite of initiation pointed, had long differentiated the Jewish people from the surrounding nations that threatened either to assimilate or to annihilate them.

It should be remembered that Paul, or Saul when designated by his Hebrew name, had earlier dreaded the very notion of breaking down these identity-preserving boundaries.² Now a follower of Christ, Paul understood that if Christ was the Savior, then he was the Savior of all and, following this, any insistence on further requirements for salvation was not only distressing but erroneous. Paul and Barnabas decided to take their case to the apostles and elders in Jerusalem. Along the way, they told every believer they could find about the ways in which they saw the Holy Spirit at work among the Gentiles. They were well received by the members of the Jerusalem church when they first arrived, but quickly faced opponents who belonged to “the sect of the Pharisees” and demanded that the Gentiles converts “be circumcised and ordered to keep the law of Moses.”³ Luke notes that the apostles and elders debated the situation at length, until Peter himself stood up and addressed the gathering.

Peter’s appearance in this council would be his last in the book of Acts, but his role here is crucial. He was, of course, the denier-turned-witness, the one who knew personally what the grace of

² See Philippians 3: 5-6.

³ Acts 15:5

God could do. He also was the one who saw that grace at work in the household of Cornelius, the Roman centurion.⁴ Peter, who had exhibited strong initial resistance to the inclusion of Gentiles had himself been convinced that “in cleansing their hearts by faith, [God] made no distinction” between Jew and Gentile.⁵ Now he challenged his fellow leaders in Jerusalem not to burden the new converts with “a yoke that neither our ancestors nor we have been able to bear.”⁶ This is Peter’s final speech in Acts.

Peter was followed by Paul and Barnabas, who spoke of the signs and wonders they had seen God accomplish among the Gentiles. It is noted that the entire gathering was captivated by their presentation. Finally, after all had been reported, James, the leader of the Jerusalem church, spoke up. James is, of course, to be distinguished from the two apostles who bore the same name, both the now-martyred son of Zebedee and the so-called James the Less. Known by his designation “the Just,” the James in Acts 15 is traditionally understood as the “brother of the Lord,” listed in both Mark 6:3 and Matthew 13:55 along with Joses, Judas, Simon, as well as unnamed and unnumbered sisters. It is interesting that the first word out of the mouth of James is “Simeon” as he referred to Peter’s experience with Cornelius. Using the Aramaic name, and not the Greek *Petros* or Peter, was perhaps an intentional and savvy move, as it served as a reminder that those to whom James was about to appeal were Jewish Christians. He continued by immediately quoting the Hebrew Scriptures, thereby appealing to the sacred text instead of to

⁴ See the whole of Acts 10.

⁵ Acts 15:9

⁶ Acts 15:10

personal experience of the Holy Spirit's work among the Gentiles, as Paul and Barnabas—and even Peter—did.

James led up to a decision that could rightly be called “the great compromise,” for it had something that appealed to both sides while, in the end, stopping short of either side's full desire. On the one hand, James recommended that the leadership there “not trouble those Gentiles who are turning to God,”⁷ meaning not force them to be circumcised, as the Judaizers demanded. On the other hand, he also suggested that the Gentiles should be clearly instructed to abstain from those things which were most obviously odious to faithful Jews. These included any items “polluted” by idols, any sexual acts associated with pagan ways, and any dietary items most strenuously condemned by the Torah. This was not a random list. Rather, the Jerusalem leaders could, in essence, insist on some control over the ever-dreaded threat of intermingling. Indeed, what had preserved Hebrew identity and culture for so long had been the “set-apartness” of the Jewish people from those people and practices deemed unclean. To take seriously the restrictions that James proposed would mean serious disengagement on the part of Gentile believers from their familiar relational networks. They could remain uncircumcised as long as they lived as though they were circumcised.

The compromise was accepted by the gathering: in fact, they used the breathtaking words, “It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us,”⁸ and together they decided to send the message to the church in Antioch. The messengers would be Paul and Barnabas, along with two other Jerusalem leaders, Judas called Barsabbas

⁷ Acts 15:19

⁸ Acts 15:28

and Silas, the latter of whom would become one of Paul's key colleagues later. The decision to send these two Jerusalem insiders with Paul and Barnabas is interesting. Earlier, Barnabas had been sent by the apostles to Antioch as their representative to check on the evangelistic activity that was occurring there. Now, inasmuch as both Barnabas and Paul were clearly associated with Antioch, it was important for others more obviously connected with Jerusalem to accompany them in order to carry the message from the apostles and elders to "the believers of Gentile origin in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia."⁹

The letter they took with them and the oral report that accompanied it offered both reassurance and recommendation. Gentile believers would not have to be circumcised, but they would need to refrain from "what has been sacrificed to idols and from blood and from what is strangled and from fornication."¹⁰ The first three items on that list obviously concern Jewish dietary laws while the fourth, "fornication," most likely refers not to sexual promiscuity in general but rather to a more specific practice of ritual prostitution.¹¹ The crucial point is that the prohibitions addressed the underlying fears on the part of those who cherished their Jewish roots and identity that without proper boundaries those roots and identity could be lost. The people welcomed what was said, and were encouraged by the words of Judas and Silas, who eventually made their way back to Jerusalem while Paul and Barnabas remained in Antioch, teaching and preaching.

⁹ Acts 15:23

¹⁰ Acts 15:29

¹¹ For details, see C.K. Robertson, *Conflict in Corinth: Redefining the System*, in *Studies in Biblical Literature*, book 42 (Pieterlen, Switzerland: Peter Lang Publishing Inc., International Academic Publishers, 2001).

Alas, the conciliar compromise, though it may have been well-received, was far from perfect, as Paul would make clear years later in his letter to the Christians in Galatia. There, in the second chapter, he speaks at length about opposing Peter to his face in Antioch when the apostle, after showing no qualms about being at the table with Gentile Christians, suddenly withdrew and refused to eat with them when representatives from James and the Jerusalem leadership came into town. Apparently, the Gentiles' acceptance of the Jerusalem Council's recommendations could not overturn countless years of deeply ingrained prejudices and fears. Nevertheless, the hypocrisy which Paul confronted in the aftermath of the Jerusalem gathering does not negate the significant step forward represented by that proto-conciliar body's work. What James, Peter, and company did there—hearing from the various conflicted parties, giving prayerful consideration to the different concerns and fears underlying the arguments, creating a compromise through the clear presentation of a reasonable solution by the leader which in turn is confirmed by group consensus—set the stage for healthy and effective future councils of the Church. Though Paul's challenge in Galatians 2 points to the importance of following through on what has been enacted, the fact remains that what we see in Acts 15 is in many ways a model for carefully facilitated compromise in the face of conflict in the work of that proto-council.

No council since has declared its decisions to be those of "the Holy Spirit and us." Nevertheless, churches since have seen their councils to be means by which the Spirit of Jesus leads them, even if those very human political means are not themselves infallible. Episcopalians, in particular, continue to meet in councils on the parish level, on the diocesan level, and on the denominational

level in the General Convention. Ordained and lay leaders together meet, pray, discuss, and deliberate. And while the decisions that emerge may not be unanimous, and the follow up not always perfect, they move forward in faith, trusting that the Spirit that leads them is the same One who worked in the midst of others like James, Peter, Paul, and Barnabas, long ago in Jerusalem.

The Key to Understanding The Episcopal Church

PIERRE W. WHALON

Is subsidiarity the key theological concept underlying the polity of The Episcopal Church?¹ This paper will argue that it is. Furthermore, subsidiarity is much more than a mere organizational principle. It is a direct result of the communion between God and the Church, and the members of the Church with one another. The concept therefore deserves much more consideration than, to date, it has received.

The most significant change from the colonial congregations to The Episcopal Church in 1789 is the limiting of churchwide powers. Before, the Crown, the Bishop of London, and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel held what theoretically was absolute power over the life of the American congregations. This was only theoretical, however, for the life of these from 1607 to 1781 was marked first by the inability of the Church of England, and later, that Church's relative indifference, to provide for their need for oversight. The colonial churches thus had considerable

¹ Pierre Whalon, "The Tale Needs Retelling: A reply to Colin Podmore's 'A tale of two churches,'" in *Theology* 114, no. 1: 3-12

leeway in ordering their lives. Yet whenever the mother church pulled the reins, the colonials obeyed.

In constituting a Church that satisfied both their need for continuity in their inherited tradition (which we would now call “Anglican”), and the respect of the albeit informal autonomy they had enjoyed, the Episcopalians developed a principle which in the twentieth century became known as “subsidiarity.” Its Latin root, *subsidium*, means “aid”.

Pius XI, in his encyclical *Quadragesima anno*, enunciated the principle:

As history abundantly proves, it is true that on account of changed conditions many things which were done by small associations in former times cannot be done now save by large associations. Still, that most weighty principle, which cannot be set aside or changed, remains fixed and unshaken in social philosophy: Just as it is gravely wrong to take from individuals what they can accomplish by their own initiative and industry and give it to the community, so also it is an injustice and at the same time a grave evil and disturbance of right order to assign to a greater and higher association what lesser and subordinate organizations can do. For every social activity ought of its very nature to furnish help to the members of the body social, and never destroy and absorb them. (paragraph no. 79, emphasis added)²

² Accessed on May 21, 2014 at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/

This idea is now at the heart of Roman Catholic social teaching, though it has not been applied to that Church's life. But it did have great significance in the creation of the European Union, as spelled out in Article V of the Treaty on European Union, which is worth quoting in full:

ARTICLE 5: 'Fundamental principles relating to competences'

1. The limits of Union competences are governed by the principle of conferral. The use of Union competences is governed by the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality.
2. Under the principle of conferral, the Union shall act within the limits of the competences conferred upon it by the Member States in the Treaties to attain the objectives set out therein. Competences not conferred upon the Union in the Treaties remain with the Member States.
3. Under the principle of subsidiarity, in areas which do not fall within its exclusive competence, the Union shall act only if and insofar as the objectives of the proposed action cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States, either at central level or at regional and local level, but can rather, by reason of the

scale or effects of the proposed action, be better achieved at Union level.

The institutions of the Union shall apply the principle of subsidiarity as laid down in the Protocol on the application of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality. National Parliaments shall ensure compliance with that principle in accordance with the procedure set out in that Protocol.

4. Under the principle of proportionality, the content and form of Union action shall not exceed what is necessary to achieve the objectives of the Treaties. The institutions of the Union shall apply the principle of proportionality as laid down in the Protocol on the application of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality.³

William White wrote in his 1782 pamphlet, *The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered*, that a churchwide “representative body” should “make such regulations, and receive appeals in such matters only, as shall be judged necessary for their continuing religious communion.”⁴ Meeting in 1784, he and fellow Pennsylvanians adjudged that “no powers be delegated to a central ecclesiastical government, except

³ Accessed May 21, 2014 at <http://www.eurotreaties.com/lisbontext.pdf>

⁴ Chapter III. Accessed May 21, 2014 at <http://anglicanhistory.org/usa/wwhite/case1782.html>

such as cannot be conveniently exercised by the clergy and laity, in their respective congregations.”⁵ As we have argued in the *Primer* of this *Report*, these concepts remain at the heart of the polity of The Episcopal Church.

From all of these, we can see that the papal encyclical and European treaty have several elements in common with the thinking at the origin of The Episcopal Church:

1. Individual people and local societies can and should make most decisions for their lives, not only as a matter of political reality but also as a moral matter.
2. Insofar as an overall unity is necessary for the maintenance of identity (that is, survival), “higher” authorities are necessary, but they exist to ensure not only the continuing identity of the whole but also the flourishing of its individual members. Therefore, their powers are to be limited to what is necessary to their functions.
3. The constituting members of the whole shall be the ones to determine the powers of the overall government.

⁵ Cited in Paul Marshall, *One, Catholic, and Apostolic: Samuel Seabury and the Early Episcopal Church* (New York: Church Publishing, 2004), 70.

This last is missing from Roman Catholic reflection on its own organization, as we shall see below, but has been reiterated in several papal encyclicals as essential to the just ordering of secular society.

So far, however, this describes what The Episcopal Church has in common with, say, the Rotary Club. Beyond these very practical considerations, what weight does the idea of subsidiarity have beyond them? The question remains as to why this idea should have moral warrant in the Church.

First, the Church “here below” lives in its outcroppings in time and space, that is, the local congregations. These require an organization to create them and keep them flourishing, beginning with the maintenance over time of their collective identity. In other words, there must be an institutionalization of their common life, first so that they can have a common life, “a religious communion,” in White’s words. This happens through the ministry of a bishop and the outgrowth of episcopal ministry, the diocese.

This point is at the heart of the conflict between the need to spread the Gospel and the need to ensure that it is indeed the Gospel that is being spread as generation succeeds generation. With the deaths of the first disciples, and the delay of the return of Christ, resources that would withstand the passage of time, and the structures to develop and nurture those resources, were essential to the survival of the Church’s identity. The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral of Bible, Creeds, sacraments, and the episcopate, is clearly the result of the necessary work begun by the second generation of Jesus’ disciples, which succeeding generations have carried on to this day. As Charles Williams

observed, the Church has to re-invent itself every thirty years.⁶ Thus the Church continues through time not through a recalling of past events, but a perpetual re-remembering of the future that belongs to God. In Catherine Pickstock's extraordinary expression, celebrating the liturgy makes us "stand *expectantly*, in a position *prior* to the 'making now' of what mundanely lies *behind* us."⁷

The Episcopal Church, as a part of Christ's One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, continues to celebrate that future. And therefore its ordering must rest not merely on convenient organizational theory or even moral law, but on doctrine. Not only must its polity be just, but its grasp of the nature of the Church—its ecclesiology—needs to be of a piece with its overall incarnational theology.

The reason why The Episcopal Church should be organized according to subsidiarity proceeds from what constitutes the Church itself. It is a truism that all moral reasoning must have as underlying support a doctrinal consideration. And as Avery Dulles pointed out, "... the Church pertains to the mystery of Christ; Christ is carrying out in his Church his plan of redemption."⁸

God's plan of redemption, or mission in creation, has the Church. It is constituted by people linked together to God through Christ in the Holy Spirit. Baptism, it has been said, creates

⁶ Charles Williams, *The Descent of the Dove* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishers, 2001), 83.

⁷ Catherine Pickstock, *After Writing: On the Liturgical Consummation of Philosophy* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998), 318. Emphasis hers.

⁸ Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church* (Garden City, NY: Image Books, 1987), 18.

solidarities not of our own choosing.⁹ Solidarity with Christ, which people freely accept after first having been chosen, but also solidarities with each other. The most obvious example is sharing the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, but also hearing and proclaiming the Gospel, baptizing others, absolving, blessing marriages, ordering people to fill the needs of the Church, healing the sick, sitting with the grieving, and freeing the physically, economically, and spiritually oppressed.

If these are what we do together, then these are what make us individually disciples of Jesus, and collectively, the Church. Underlying this activity is the unifying and empowering action of the Spirit. In Baptism, each of us receives the gift of the Spirit, to transform us for the ministry we have been given, each of us individually, but exercising it “commun-ally.” And as “communities,” each congregation exercises as one various ministries of witness, teaching, blessing, and celebrating, in its own time and place.¹⁰

Every congregation existing in the world today, no matter to which church it belongs, has antecedents. The work of the first witnesses to Jesus Christ has gone forward over two millennia until Christianity is now the world’s largest religion. No congregation today came into being on its own. Even the first Church, Jerusalem, had as its ancestor the earthly ministry of Jesus and the women and men who followed him, saw him crucified, buried him, and witnessed his resurrection. The gift of

⁹ Attributed to Rowan Williams, who replied to a query about its origin that he could not find the reference, “though it sounds like me.”

¹⁰ See “Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry – the Lima Text” (Faith and Order Paper 111, World Council of Churches): Ministry III. D. Accessed 10 October 2014 at http://oikoumene.net/eng_global/eng.lima82/eng.lima.4.3/index.html

the Spirit made them the Church, as the same gift poured out in each generation continues to ensure that the Word of God is preached and the sacraments of the New Covenant are celebrated, “proclaiming the Lord’s death until he comes.”¹¹ There is no reason to believe this is some ossified institution: the Holy Spirit enacts each gift as a new event in God’s freedom.

Within this great river flowing through time is The Episcopal Church. Each of its congregations belongs to a diocese under a bishop meeting in convention (synod), and all the dioceses are subject to the General Convention. These are the institutional outcroppings in time and space of the inner relation that binds all of us together: Communion.

Building on the hint in White’s Case that the point of such structures is to do those things that “shall be judged necessary for their continuing one religious communion,” I will now argue that subsidiarity, properly understood, is not freedom of the local, recognized and granted by a higher authority. This is implicit in Pius XI’s formulation of it. Rather, subsidiarity is the principle based upon the rock of the “comm-union” of all the disciples of Christ. The power necessary to continue “one religious communion” comes from the gift of the Spirit manifested first and foremost in the local congregation. This is not only manifested in its individual members, but like the lampstands before the throne in St. John the Divine’s apocalyptic vision,¹² each congregation itself shows forth the universal Church in miniature, in the Spirit.

¹¹ I Cor. 11:26

¹² Revelation 1:12, 20

While power in The Episcopal Church does flow from local to churchwide bodies, it also flows in the reverse direction. Every one of the Church's congregations came from an antecedent body, and not merely a mother parish. The original congregations that made The Episcopal Church in 1789 had all been part of the Church of England's Diocese of London, under the governorship of the British Crown, if only formally. That diocese had an antecedent, albeit a very long time ago (the present Bishop of London is the 133rd).

Therefore, while the local congregation is where the Church appears in time and space, and, as a community and as individuals, does the part of God's mission in creation that the Spirit commissions it to do, it cannot be sufficient unto itself. We are not only in communion with one another; we are also in communion with those who have gone before. This can be understood not only in its properly mystical sense, but also in the mundane fact that we are our past. We have always been standing expectantly, in a position prior to the "making now" of what lies behind us. For us to be here and now, others had to come before, and the power they exercised to build up the Church came not only from the local but also from the universal.

While affirming that it is the Risen Jesus who is doing the work of salvation through the Church, of course, it is also crucial to note that structures that are wider than the local are essential to the maintenance and development of the human aspect of God's mission: "... continuing in one religious communion."¹³

The relationship between the local and the wider communities should be governed by subsidiarity, understood as

¹³ See note 4.

the maintenance, development, and deepening of Communion, not only together with one another but also with the Triune God. Ministers discerned and elected for the task should constitute the bodies that ensure these. It begins with the Vestry or Bishop's Committee, who act with the Priest-in-charge to see to it that the living God is worshipped, the Word is preached, the Faith is taught, and the sacraments duly administered.

In the accomplishment of their duties and in the larger picture of the congregation's ministry, certain needs will arise that the congregation cannot meet for itself. These are decisions about doctrine, discipline, and worship. There will also be other things that the local church may need: help with Christian formation, for instance, financing, compliance with secular law, etc.

The wider, regional body that exists to meet the needs that the local congregations cannot meet for themselves is the diocese. Its ministry turns around the work of the bishop, and the clergy and lay leaders elected to share in the bishop's oversight of all its congregations. The first need that the diocese meets is to launch new congregations. Every parish exists because it is part of a diocese. The ministry of the bishop and diocese is first that of unifying all its congregations, as well as creating and making available resources for their flourishing. It is also a ministry of oversight, meaning the power to create new congregations, close dying ones, and to intervene when events are bearing a congregation away from healthy communal living. For all these reasons, Anglicans refer to the diocese and not the congregation as "the local church."

Dioceses also have needs that they cannot meet on their own. The first is their creation, obviously. As we saw in the *Primer*, the

dioceses of The Episcopal Church did not exist before the General Convention made it possible for them to become dioceses and not merely occasional meetings. Dioceses' needs are churchwide, and all concern unity as well. The establishment (and occasional revision) of the Book of Common Prayer is one of them. Carrying forward a constitution and canons is another. Collective decisions on doctrine are sometimes required, both in the doctrinal and moral spheres.

Ecumenical relations with other churches in this age of the outwardly fractured Church cannot be the purview of a single diocese. Interreligious relations are another matter for the whole Church, although the churchwide body should create and make available resources for local (diocesan) dialogues and other joint actions.

The formation of deacons and priests requires the attention of the whole Church, in terms of standards, even though such training takes place in seminaries and diocesan schools. The elections, consecrations, and formation of bishops must also be a churchwide matter, and handled at that level.¹⁴ Furthermore, deployment of clergy can only be effectively maintained at the same level.

Only the General Convention holds the power to rule on doctrine, discipline and worship for all Episcopalians. It often addresses issues of society, but in these cases, such rulings are only the "mind" of the two Houses. Like the Lambeth Conference, these decisions are only recommendatory: "the mind of the

¹⁴ See *Theological Education in the Anglican Communion*, an attempt to do this on a global level. <http://www.aco.org/ministry/theological/teac/> accessed on June 2, 2014.

Convention,” not The Episcopal Church.¹⁵ In keeping with the principle of subsidiarity, the Convention’s powers are not unrestricted, therefore.

On the other hand, the creation of dioceses is the sole purview of the Convention, as it involves the creation of a new bishopric. Beyond conforming to the General Canons, however, the dioceses have great latitude, even deciding to merge, if such an action reverses the division of a previous diocese¹⁶. The General Convention’s powers are limited to matters of the whole, though those decisions within its purview can be reversed only by actions of future Conventions. Thus, The Episcopal Church’s form of government is neither “confederal” nor “federal”, but “unitary”.¹⁷

In order to meet these needs when Convention is not in session, The Episcopal Church has an Executive Council, with the Presiding Bishop as president, and the President of the House of Deputies as vice-president. Finally, there must be an official who can speak for the Church to the world and to the rest of the Anglican Communion. The Presiding Bishop fills these roles for Episcopalians. The principle of subsidiarity must inform all these

¹⁵ There are decisions that have an intermediate status, such as the teachings on abortion, the death penalty, or interreligious relations approved by a General Convention. These have official status, but cannot command the allegiance of the faithful. Their effect on the ordained, who have sworn to “uphold the doctrine, discipline, and worship” of the church, may be more significant, though how much is an open question.

¹⁶ Though this decision still requires the approval of General Convention. See Article V of the Constitution.

¹⁷ See James Dator, *Many Parts, One Church: How The Episcopal Church Works* (New York: Church Publishing, 2010), 142ff.

ongoing ministries, as much as it is to guide the work of the General Convention.

Two challenges of subsidiarity

As the history of the European Union attests, the practical application of subsidiarity is not simple. (It is necessary to distinguish the Union, with its currently twenty-eight member nations, from the “Eurozone”, those eighteen members of the Union that participate in the common currency, the Euro.) The basic challenge is to know when the European Commission and Parliament should rule, and when national sovereignty continues to be respected. Recent popular discontent centers on the Commission making rules for the whole Union concerning, for example, the use of wooden instruments in making cheese. In other words, not respecting subsidiarity. There is also growing anger at what is *not* brought under common rule: banking, foreign policy, defense, and so on—another defect, this time in reverse, of the application of subsidiarity.¹⁸

The same issue surfaces in the life of The Episcopal Church. For example, the question has been raised by what authority the Presiding Bishop decided not to allow the sale of properties to dissidents affiliated with several schismatic bodies, and to go to court to have properties and funds returned. The former was only possible with the support (or not) of the several bishops concerned, and the latter could be authorized, as the Presiding

¹⁸ For a brilliant analysis of these and related problems, see Yanis Varoufakis, *And the Weak Suffer What They Must: Europe, Austerity, and the Threat to Global Security* (London: Vintage, 2016). The great difficulty in the implementation of Great Britain’s possible exit from the Union (“Brexit”) shows how hard it is to leave a government based on subsidiarity. This writer fervently hopes it shall not come to pass.

Bishop is also the president of the legal entity of the Church, the Domestic & Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, Inc. Since this arguably concerned the survival of the church, these actions were in fact not inconsistent with the polity of the church, though the fact that questions were raised shows that the intervention of the common authority in a member's life is always extraordinary and temporary—which are marks of the application of subsidiarity.

A clearer example was the 2011 intervention by the Presiding Bishop and the whole House of Bishops in the Diocese of Ecuador Central, in which the life of the diocese was severely compromised by the actions of some lay and clergy leaders. The bishop elected for the diocese by the House of Bishops resigned, for his own welfare, and the standing committee was dissolved.

It may seem peculiar that the General Convention creates a diocese, but it does not have the power to reunite two dioceses that once formed only one without the consent of both. Also, diocesan constitutions and canons are not regulated by Convention, except that they must not contradict the General Constitution and Canons. These instances, however, are examples of subsidiarity properly applied. Dioceses reuniting because of local conditions of mission do not need help to make that decision. Requiring the permission of the General Convention would be unnecessary interference in their decision-making. The same is true for diocesan canons, which must be adapted to local laws and customs—again, something best decided at the local church level.

Prudence is absolutely required in any government, sacred or secular, that respects the principle of subsidiarity.

An even greater challenge is to discern when subsidiarity does *not* apply. In the life of the Church that concerns doctrine.

At the October 2001 Synod of Roman Catholic Bishops, then-Cardinal Jorge Mario Bergoglio expressed the inapplicability of subsidiarity in his church, referring to “the singular hierarchical structure of the Church, existing by the will of Christ.” The future Pope Francis went on to say that the autonomy of the local bishop “coexists with the supreme authority of the Pope, which is also episcopal, ordinary and immediate over all the churches and over all the shepherds and faithful.”¹⁹

Anglicans do not have, and do not want, such authority. But what kind of authority do we have? To put it another way, does the General Convention have the power to change the doctrine of the Church?

The Preamble to the church’s Constitution declares this:

The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, otherwise known as The Episcopal Church (which name is hereby recognized as also designating the Church), is a constituent member of the Anglican Communion, a Fellowship within the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, of those duly constituted Dioceses, Provinces, and regional Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury, upholding and propagating the historic Faith and Order as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer.

¹⁹ Quoted by Zenit Press. Accessed May 27, 2014, At www.ewtn.com/library/BISHOPS/ZSUBSIDI.HTM

To “uphold and propagate the historic Faith and Order” does not seem to give the Convention the power to change these. Of course, this Preamble was added by the same Convention to the Constitution in 1967, and it could, by vote of two successive Conventions, amend or delete it. In theory, therefore, the General Convention could change the doctrine of the Church.

The self-definition of The Episcopal Church since its beginning has, however, been to continue in the faith it inherited from the Church of England. Furthermore, being in communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury has always been part of that identity, and presumably, the General Convention would not want to threaten that.²⁰

Moreover, the mention of the Book of Common Prayer is also an important limit. Just as every congregation and diocese has an historical antecedent, the present Book of Common Prayer is also the latest in a line of constituting Books: 1928, 1892, 1789, 1662, 1559, 1552, and 1549. Despite the accretions of other sources of worship (Enriching Our Worship, the Anglican Missal, etc.), the Prayer Book is a constitutional document whose text and rubrics have the full force of canon law.²¹ Every revision of the Book entailed some adjustment of focus on doctrinal questions, but it cannot be argued persuasively that the credal statements—the heart of Christian doctrine—have ever been modified by addition or subtraction, or eliminated.

The discipline of the Church, to which all Episcopal clergy swear

²⁰ The fact that The Episcopal Church has paid far more attention to the proposed Anglican Covenant than any other province of the Communion argues in favor of this assertion.

²¹ See General Canons, Title IV.4.1(b).

to conform, is another matter. Already the Church of England had significantly changed it, well before The Episcopal Church came into being. Marriage of clergy, use of the vernacular, communion in both kinds, the Scriptures as final authority in the Church, laity sharing in the government of the Church, and above all, the institution of the Book of Common Prayer as “the law of believing,”²² these changes to previous discipline were the inheritance of the English Reformation. Remarriage of the divorced, ordination of women to all three Orders, blessing of same-sex unions, are three major changes to The Episcopal Church’s discipline made by the General Convention. While these have doctrinal considerations, of course, they are principally matters of discipline—what the Church itself allows and disallows on its own authority.²³

Subsidiarity operates in this area “in reverse”: the local church must respect such decisions. They cannot properly be made at the local level, as these decisions have global implications. Changes in discipline and adjustment of focus on this or that dogma require the authority of the whole Church. Subsidiarity does not abolish hierarchy, as some believe. Rather, it should establish a hierarchy that conforms to the Reign of God—the greatest being servant of all.²⁴

²² *Lex orandi, lex credendi* is the Latin shorthand for this dictum: the way we pray expresses what we believe.

²³ Many would argue that allowing the blessing of same-sex unions (and ordaining people in them) is a change of doctrine. It is. However, it is a change of a moral question, not a creedal one. Moral doctrines are, with few exceptions (“love your neighbor as yourself”), contextual, not formal. For instance, the moral doctrine against usury, taught for the major portion of the Church’s existence, has disappeared, as lending with interest has become a mainstay of the world economy, cautiously approved by the Church.

²⁴ Widely attested: e.g., Matthew 23:11; 20:26, 27; Mark 10:43, 44; Luke 22:26, 27;

Understood in this way, the Roman Catholic exemption of its government to its understanding of subsidiarity can be seen to apply to The Episcopal Church as well, though in a very different way. The real difference is that decisions about doctrine rest in the hands of the Deputies and Bishops together, and these decisions can be revisited and changed, if need be. The Episcopal Church is strongly conscious of itself as a part, a fraction, of the whole Church (which is why ecumenism has been so important in its life). Therefore authority is given to a governing council whose fallibility is a given.²⁵ While no part of the Church should make decisions about creedal doctrine for the whole (violating subsidiarity), this consideration only applies to a Church united, or rather, re-united. In the present state of the Christian Church's brokenness, we have to make decisions that we conclude are necessary to being faithful disciples of Christ in the here and now.

From this discussion, it is clear that subsidiarity is a moral doctrine that is a formal, not contextual, norm.²⁶ It is the logical outgrowth of the doctrine of Communion, the basic relation that is simultaneously "vertical and horizontal."

John Zizioulas argues that ecclesiologists have over the centuries separated the Body of Christ image that Paul developed into watertight compartments, as it were: Christology, ecclesiology

John 13:14, 15; 1 Corinthians 9:19; 2 Corinthians 4:5; 2 Corinthians 11:23; Galatians 5:13; Philippians 2:5-8, etc.

²⁵ See in this *Report* R. William Franklin's "Conciliarism and the Ecclesiology of The Episcopal Church", and Charles Robertson's "Proto-conciliarism in Acts 15", on the biblical base for this manner of governing the Church's life.

²⁶ See note 21 above.

and the Eucharist.²⁷ In order to understand the nature of the Church, however, these must always be considered together, as the Apostle himself did.²⁸ Thomas Cranmer's post-communion prayer in the 1549 Prayer Book hints at such a reconnection:

ALMIGHTYE and everlyvyng GOD, we moste hartely thanke thee, for that thou hast vouchsafed to feede us in these holy Misteries, with the spirituall foode of the moste precious body and bloud of thy sonne, our saviour Jesus Christ, and haste assured us (duely receiving the same) of thy favour and goodnes toward us, and that we be very membres incorporate in thy Misticall bodye, whiche is the blessed companye of all faythfull people, and heyres through hope of thy everlasting kingdome, by the merites of the most precious death and passion, of thy deare sonne...²⁹

The "Misteries" refers to *musterion*, translated into Latin as *sacramentum*. Its root is *muo*, "to be silent", which it shares with *mustikos* or "mystical". Zizioulas points out that the original meaning of "mystical" was not an individual, ineffable experience separate from the "ordinary" life of the institutional Church. Rather it belongs to every member. While he does not mention it, the driving force of the Protestant Reformation was arguably the

²⁷ William Gregg's article in this Report is an argument to re-unite these.

²⁸ John Zizioulas, *Communion and Otherness* (London: T & T Clark, 2006), 286.

²⁹ http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1549/Communion_1549.htm Accessed on July 10, 2014.

desire to give back to all members of the Church, not just monastics, the possibility of mystical experience.³⁰

This experience is not a conscious one: it does not happen in our consciousness but in our relation. "The crucial thing is not what happens in me, but what happens between me and someone else."³¹ In Baptism, completed by Eucharist, grace draws us into adoption as children of God, the God who is love. This God is because of the relations among Father, Son and Spirit, which allow each to be one and yet, other as well.

The Church as the Body of Christ points to a mysticism of communion and relationship through which one is so united with the "other" (God and our neighbor) as to form one indivisible unity through which otherness emerges clearly, and the partners in the relationship are distinct and particular not as individuals of a species but as persons.³²

To live this fundamental reality in the Church is to serve one another as Christ serves us. Therefore, subsidiarity as organizing principle is a moral imperative for governance, growing as it does out of the communion between us—you and me—and God. It should shape and inform not just the practice of ordained ministry, or of governing councils and synods, but indeed the life of all the baptized.

Communion with the Father through the Son in the Spirit is the gift that Jesus Christ won for us on the cross, and sealed with

³⁰ Steven E. Ozment, *Homo Spiritualis*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1969) 45f.

³¹ Zizioulas, *Communion*, 306. Emphasis in the original.

³² *Ibid.*, 307. For Zizioulas, individuals are members of the species, persons are identities that emerge through relationships—"an 'I' that can exist only as long as it relates to a 'thou' which affirms its existence and its otherness." (p. 9).

his resurrection and the sending of the Spirit. This unmerited gift that invites each person to share in the life of the Triune God requires each of us to see the shape of the common life that it creates, a communion of hearts, minds and bodies in which each of us is the servant of the other.³³ This service of subsidiarity respects the integrity of the individual Christian, the work of the Spirit in the congregation, the ministry of servanthood to each of these. At the same time it requires that all respect and seek to share fully in the life of the whole Church, “that wonderful and sacred mystery.”³⁴

³³ See William Gregg’s essay “What is ecclesiology?” in this *Report*.

³⁴ From the Collect for Good Fridays and Ordinations.

Conciliarism and the Ecclesiology of The Episcopal Church

*A Review of Resources on the
Authority of the General Convention*

WILLIAM FRANKLIN

This essay¹ has three themes: the authority of the General Convention of The Episcopal Church; the ecclesiological arguments which support this authority; and the origins of these theological arguments within the movement known as “conciliarism.” In addition, the essay has three goals: first, to show that conciliarism is but one among many ecclesiological themes that can be found to link The Episcopal Church’s General Convention to the early Christian Church; second, to provide a review of the scholarship on this topic; and finally to invite readers to further debate on the authority of General Convention at a time when the relevance and effectiveness

¹ This is an expanded version of two articles that originally appeared in *The Living Church*: R. William Franklin, “Conciliarism and Convention’s Authority,” *The Living Church*, Vol. 243, No. 7, September 25, 2011; pp. 19-21; and R. William Franklin, “No Higher Human Authority,” *The Living Church*, Vol. 243, No. 8, October 9, 2011; pp. 20-22. I wish to thank Mr. Richard J. Mammana, Board of Directors of *The Living Church*, and Dr. Christopher Wells, Executive Director of *The Living Church*, for their advice and counsel on those two original articles and on this expanded essay.

of all institutions of The Episcopal Church are under review.²

² My two original *Living Church* articles were intended to initiate such a debate. Bishop Daniel Martins introduced the debate in Daniel H. Martins, "The Authority of General Convention: A Conversation," *The Living Church*, Vol. 243, No. 7, September 25, 2011, pp. 18-19. Prof. Ephraim Radner responded to my original articles in Ephraim Radner, "Authority Under Larger Authority," *The Living Church*, Vol. 243, No. 7, September 25, 2011, pp. 21-24; and Ephraim Radner, "The Local Church Serves the Whole," *The Living Church*, Vol. 243, No. 8, October 9, 2011, pp. 22-25. I wish to thank both Bishop Martins and Prof. Radner for their responses to and support of our producing these articles on conciliarism. In their articles published as part of our exchange and in their other writings, they have raised questions which differ from the point of view I express in this essay, and I want to acknowledge these differences at the outset. In his introduction to the 2011 essays Bishop Martins raises this question: "Is General Convention, for Episcopalians, tantamount to the sort of 'council' that has broad authority to define doctrine, to propound church teaching, and to bind the conscience of the faithful?" (9/25/11, p. 19). Prof. Radner in his responses to my position also raises five fundamental questions that the reader should bear in mind:

"Is General Convention a true council of the Church, and if so what kind?" He says later "...she is not a council in her own right...." (9/11/15, pp. 21, 24).

"...conciliarism was definitely not ordered to a regional or national understanding of the Church...." (10/9/11, p. 22).

"...conciliarists were clear that 'ultimate authority' always lay outside the council...." (10/9/11, p. 23).

"...General Convention has never claimed such authority over dioceses, its Constitution does not contain references to such claimed authority...." (10/9/11, p. 25). (10/9/11, p. 25).

Most importantly, Prof. Radner asks for a theological perspective on the claimed authority of the General Convention: "Indeed, the theological perspective tells us why the juridical perspective regarding General Convention is as limited as it seems to be. For it tells us that the weight of ecclesial decision-making in these important areas—that today touch on the issues of ordination, same-sex blessings and marriages, Trinitarian doctrines and language, ecclesial communion—cannot and should not lie with General Convention at all! Rather it lies elsewhere." (9/25/11, p.24).

This conversation is necessary in the light of the call to examine the institutions and structures of the wider Episcopal Church issued by the 77th General Convention and the establishment of the Task Force for Reimagining The

The Authority of General Convention

One place to begin a discussion on the authority of General Convention is the 1964 concurrent resolution of the Convention of that year on “Levels of Authority within the Church”:

“Sec. 1. The Protestant Episcopal Church accepts as its authority the Holy Scriptures, the Nicene and Apostles Creeds and speaks through the Book of Common Prayer and the Constitution and Canons of the Church. The Protestant Episcopal Church speaks also through Resolutions, Statements and actions of the General Convention. In these ways the Church speaks at the highest level of responsibility for the Church to the Church and to the world.”³

This phrase “highest level of responsibility” means that the General Convention has the final authority over all budget, policies, and programs of the wider Church. It possesses the liturgical authority to revise the Book of Common Prayer (in order to insure uniformity in worship), the constitutional authority to amend the Constitution and Canons of the wider Church, and the ecclesial authority to admit new dioceses and elect some bishops. The Convention can articulate doctrine and it holds disciplinary authority over all bishops, dioceses, and parishes. There is no appeal from its decisions and no diocese may contravene its

Episcopal Church. TREC’s report of December 2014, “Engaging God’s Mission in the 21st Century: Final Report of the Task Force for Reimagining The Episcopal Church” (<https://extranet.generalconvention.org/staff/files/download/12219.pdf>) does not contain a discussion of the history or theological background of current Episcopal Church institutions and structures. History and theology are essential for any re-imagining of the Church.

³ 1964 *Journal of the General Convention*, pp. 312-313.

legislation. Therefore, the legislative authority of the General Convention is unrestricted.⁴

As a further example of this supreme authority, the Primate of The Episcopal Church, the Presiding Bishop, possesses no independent authority above that of the General Convention. By contrast, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York possess their own metropolitan authority and are not accountable to the General Synod of the Church of England. The Presiding Bishop's authority and actions are derivative of that of the General Convention.⁵

Canon I.2. Sec. 4(a) (on the powers of the Presiding Bishop) makes it clear that his or her leadership is always subject to the Constitution and Canons and to other directives of the General Convention. He or she is "charged with responsibility for leadership in initiating and developing the policy and strategy in the Church and speaking for the Church as to the policies, strategies, and programs authorized by the General Convention."⁶

In 1982 the replacement of "Presiding Bishop" by "Archbishop"

⁴ The House of Deputies special study committee on Church Governance and Polity, *Shared Governance: The Polity of The Episcopal Church* (New York: Church Publishing, 2012).

⁵ William Joseph Barnds, "A Study of the Development of the Office of Presiding Bishop of the American Episcopal Church, 1794-1944," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, Vol. 27, No. 4 (1958): 254-286; Walter D. Dennis, "Electing the Presiding Bishop: Proposed Changes for 1997 and 2006," *Anglican and Episcopal History*, Vol. 65, No. 3 (1996)278-292. See also Roland Foster, *The Role of the Presiding Bishop* (New York: Church Publishing, 1982).

⁶ Canon I.2: Sec. 4(a)1; *Constitution and Canons of The Episcopal Church* (New York: Church Publishing, 2009), 28. See also Joint Nominating Committee for the Election of the Presiding Bishop, "Third Educational Piece: The Evolving Role and the Changing Selection Process of the Presiding Bishop," (2014, <http://www.episcopalchurch.org/notice/joint-nominating-committee-presents-last-three-essays>), 10-11.

CONCILIARISM AND THE ECCLESIOLOGY 451
OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

as the title of the Primate was rejected by the House of Bishops to make it clear that the Presiding Bishop had no independent authority of that of a metropolitan. At the Convention of 1982 the House of Deputies agreed to adding "Primate" to the Presiding Bishop's title only following "considerable debate as to whether or not 'Primate' was a slippery slope towards a feared and unwanted metropolitan authority in the office of Presiding Bishop."⁷

There has been widespread agreement that the scope of this authority of General Convention is unique among the self-governing Provinces and Churches of the Anglican Communion. But on the question of how that authority came to be, is to be theologically supported, named in ecclesiology, and located historically—there has not been a consensus.⁸

Three scholars come to the same conclusions that I have:

1. Colin Podmore in an article of 2008 states:

The question of whether The Episcopal Church is essentially a federal, confederate, or unitary body has been the focus of much discussion.

⁷ Robert C. Royce, "The Roles, Duties and Responsibilities of the Executive Council, Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society, Presiding Bishop and President of the House of Deputies in the Governance of the Episcopal Church," MS Word document dated May 31, 2008, Accession No. 2009.011: The Archives of The Episcopal Church, p. 10.

⁸ Some documents filed in property cases involving The Episcopal Church seek to make the case that the General Convention does not have final authority over the dioceses and that its legislative authority is restricted. Two examples are: MS "Affidavit of Dr. Jeremy Bonner in the Circuit Court of the Eighth Judicial Circuit of the State of Illinois, Adams County," 2011, particularly p. 65; and Mark McCall, MS, "Is the Episcopal Church Hierarchical?" September 2008.

Ultimately, it must be said to be unitary, in that the power of the General Convention is supreme and unlimited. It is not confederal, in that the General Convention's decisions do not require the assent of the diocesan conventions in order to come into effect ... The Episcopal Church is not a federal Church, in that there is no division of powers between the General Convention and the dioceses; the Constitution of the General Convention does not reserve any powers to the dioceses.⁹

2. James A. Dator's unpublished 1959 American University dissertation, "Government in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America—Confederal, Federal or Unitary," finds the ecclesiology of The Episcopal Church to be unitary, purely hierarchical, and not made up of a union of separate dioceses which each possess individually within themselves ultimate independent authority. Dator goes so far as to defend and document the idea that the ancient canons of the Undivided Church and the catholic faith itself are interpreted and adapted solely by the General Convention within the

⁹ Colin Podmore, "A Tale of Two Churches: The Ecclesiologies of The Episcopal Church and the Church of England Compared," in *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (May 2008): 129-130.

polity of The Episcopal Church.¹⁰

3. Prof. Bruce Mullin in a decade of testimony and submitted documents in court cases involving The Episcopal Church provides extensive evidence that supports this conclusion:

“This concept of the inherent legislative authority of the General Convention was evident from the very beginning... the General Convention has consistently acted as a body with supreme authority.”¹¹

But the question remains: where do we find the model, precedent, and theological basis for such an institution in Church history? In 2008 Robert C. Royce was asked to prepare a study paper on the governance of The Episcopal Church for the Executive Council. He introduces the General Convention with these words: “Article I of the Constitutions begins ‘There shall be a General Convention of this Church consisting of the House of

¹⁰ James Allen Dator, “The Government of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America: Confederal, Federal, or Unitary (1959: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The American University, <http://www.edow.org>). James Dator’s own words may be found in published form in James Dator, with Jan Nunley, *Many Parts, One Body* (New York: Church Publishing, 2010), 144: “...there is no limit at all upon the Convention’s governing powers, unless it be the ancient canons and the necessity of conforming to the Catholic faith: but these are interpreted finally by the General Convention alone.”

¹¹ Robert Bruce Mullin, “Statement of Robert Bruce Mullin of September 2010,” entered in the Circuit Court of the Eighth Judicial Circuit of the State of Illinois, Adams County, 2011, pp. 31, 55.

Bishops and the House of Deputies...,' which enunciates the great principle that this is a national Church, and that such a convention was to be its highest council attaching to it every power inherent in such a body."¹²

What is crucial here are the words "its highest council attaching to it every power inherent in such a body." Royce uses the word "council," rather than "synod" or "convention" to identify the historical precedents and the theology of the General Convention as the ultimate unit of church government of this autonomous province of the Anglican Communion. By the choice and application of the word "council" to identify General Convention a crucial door is opened to understanding the authority of this Church which is at the heart of this present project of a committee of the House of Bishops: to present the ecclesiology of The Episcopal Church at this time of re-imagining the Church.

Ecclesiology

The purpose of this collection of essays is both to define ecclesiology and apply it as a tool in the current evaluation of the institutions of the Church. Bishop Pierre Whalon states in the Preface that we "...are confronting several challenges and considering how to adapt to the rapidly changing circumstances of our times." In the midst of this "... a central issue is that of authority." Ecclesiology directs us to use several sources in this re-evaluation of structures of authority, above all "the thoughts of theologians," and "the history of the Church."¹³ Bishop William

¹² Royce, "The Roles, Duties, and Responsibilities," 1.

¹³ "A Primer on the Government of The Episcopal Church and its Underlying

CONCILIARISM AND THE ECCLESIOLOGY 455
OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

Gregg defines “ecclesiology” for our House of Bishops Committee as “...the disciplined, theological thinking about the Church...”¹⁴ Ecclesiology is the systematic study of trends and movements concerning church authority that still influence us today.

In his responses to my 2011 essays on the authority of General Convention, Professor Ephraim Radner asked for a similar analysis of three components of the authority of General Convention:

1. “...the juridical level of the explicit laws that govern General Convention,....”¹⁵
2. “...and second on the theological level that explicates General Convention within the context of the general nature of a Christian church as The Episcopal Church has understood this.”¹⁶
3. And finally, we must look at General Convention within the “evolving context” of how the authority of church institutions has been understood over time.¹⁷ There has been

Theology,” in “Re-Membering and Re-Imagining.”

¹⁴ William O. Gregg, “What is Ecclesiology?” in “Re-Membering and Re-Imagining.”

¹⁵ Radner, “Authority Under Larger Authority,” 21.

¹⁶ Radner, “Authority Under Larger Authority,” 21.

¹⁷ Radner, “Authority Under Larger Authority,” 24.

widespread discussion of all of these questions within the Anglican Communion since 2003.¹⁸

Is there any one movement of ecclesiology that can link the juridical level, the theological level, and the historical level of General Convention to the long millennia of the evolution of the Christian Church?

The Conciliar Movement

I believe there is such a link, and it is conciliarism. The foundations of what has come to be called the Conciliar Movement were laid in the twelfth century by German, French, Spanish, and Italian canon lawyers and decretists. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the Conciliar Movement became a project of those Scholastic theologians concerned with ecclesiology. In the face of the rising claims of the absolute monarchical authority of the papacy over the whole Church articulated by the Gregorian Reform Movement of the eleventh century, medieval canon lawyers launched a legal counter-argument: that ultimate authority in the Church lies not with the single primatial office of the Bishop of Rome, but in a corporate body, a council, that is representative of the people of the Church.

When the conciliar theologians were faced with the deep institutional crises of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, they put forth an ecclesiology that defended the authority of representative gathered councils as a permanent element in the government of the Church and as instruments of reform and

¹⁸ For a review article on the most significant books on the ecclesiology of authority within Anglicanism since 2003, with special attention to the topic of conciliarism, see Ellen K. Wondra, "Questioning Authority," *The Anglican Theological Review*, Vol. 97, No. 2 (Spring 2015): 307-325.

unity. The Council of Constance, 1414-1417, guided by the conciliarists, called for the reform of the Church in “head and members.” It prescribed a strategy to do this through the calling of general councils periodically, gatherings that would each possess two fundamental characteristics:

1. General Councils derived their authority from the people of the Church, the *congregatio fidelium*, and thus were to be representative assemblies of clergy and laity.¹⁹
2. The papal leadership of the Church stood within, and not above, the general councils. The authority of councils was to be “over the patriarchs and the Roman pontiff.”²⁰

Paul Valliere concludes that a lasting contribution of the Conciliar Movement by the mid-fifteenth century was “to make the case for constitutionalism in the Roman Catholic Church by placing limits on papal power ... the notion of constitutionalism was conciliarism’s greatest achievement.”²¹ If supreme authority

¹⁹ Brian Tierney, *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory: The Contribution of the Medieval Canonists from Gratian to the Great Schism* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 214; Francis Oakley, *The Conciliarist Tradition: Constitutionalism in the Catholic Church 1300-1870* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), vii; Paul Valliere, *Conciliarism: A History of Decision-Making in the Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 142.

²⁰ Nicholas of Cusa quoted in Valliere, *Conciliarism*, 151; Tierney, *Foundations*, 220.

²¹ Valliere, *Conciliarism*, 143.

was to be placed within a representative assembly rather than upon a single primatial office of the Church, then the Church required a constitution.²²

There were, therefore, three stages of the Conciliar Movement:

1. The thirteenth-century canonists' defense of councils in opposition to rising papal claims;
2. The fourteenth-century cardinals and Scholastics turning to councils as a means to reform and unity;
3. The fifteenth-century conciliar theologians turn to the necessity of a constitution, based on the commentaries of the medieval canon lawyers, in order for conciliarism to survive.

The evolution of this trajectory was based upon and parallel to the three initiatives we are called upon to take today in The Episcopal Church:

1. Reflection and commentaries on the juridical and institutional structures of the Church by medieval canon lawyers;
2. Theological reflection on the experience of authoritative councils of the fifteenth century

²² Valliere, *Conciliarism*, 142-143.

CONCILIARISM AND THE ECCLESIOLOGY 459
OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

by significant theologians such as Nicholas of Cusa (1401-1464);

3. This work done within the recognition of a deep crisis facing the institutional Church.

The evolution of the Conciliar Movement cannot be separated from such a period of a series of disasters in Church history. The Great Schism was a period of chaos from 1378 to 1417 in which the papacy was no institutional source of unity. There were at times three popes at once, including Urban VI, Clement VII, and Alexander V. A practical test of the Conciliar Movement happened between 1414 and 1417, when the Western Church faced again the dilemma of three popes ruling at once: John XXIII, Gregory XII, and Benedict XIII.

In response to this the Holy Roman Emperor Sigismund presided over a general council that met in the imperial city of Constance. By its own authority the Council of Constance re-established unity by deposing two popes, John XXIII and Benedict XIII. Constance took steps to reform the Church and protect it from heresy by condemning the teaching of John Wycliffe (already dead) and John Huss whom it burned at the stake on July 6, 1415.

Conciliarism

Conciliarism must be seen as a broader topic than the medieval Conciliar Movement alone if we are to understand how it is a source for the General Convention. This section defines the term conciliarism and looks both backwards from the Middle Ages, and forward. It makes clear that the Conciliar Movement

looked backwards to the conciliarism of the patristic era as the basis for its own understanding of authority. We look forward by means of an overview of the selective historiography of the topic over the last sixty years, which has treated the conciliarism of the Middle Ages and how it shaped the future.

“Conciliarism” is a perfectly orthodox strand of catholic ecclesiology that is the natural outgrowth of the role that councils played in the ancient Church. Frederick Shriver defines these councils as “those representative gatherings which meet for the purpose of mutual consent or consensus in Christian belief and practice.”²³

Conciliarists appeal to Acts 15 as their Scriptural proof-text for the final authority of councils by contrast to the defenders of the absolute power of the papacy who go to Matthew 16 (“You are Peter”). Acts 15:2-6 describes a “Council at Jerusalem” to which “Paul and Barnabas and some others were appointed to go ... to discuss their question [circumcision] with the Apostles and the elders.”²⁴

A continuing tradition of such “conciliar practice” can be traced from the end of the second century.²⁵ These were regional gatherings until a layman, the Emperor Constantine, assembled bishops at Nicaea in 325 for the first international general council to produce our Creed. The fourth international general council, assembled in 451 by another layman, the Emperor Marcion, issued regulations on doctrine and discipline governing the whole Church.

²³ Frederick H. Shriver, “Councils, Conferences, and Synods,” in *The Study of Anglicanism*, eds. Stephen Sykes and John Booty (London: SPCK, 1988), 189.

²⁴ For Acts 15 as a Scriptural foundation for conciliarism see Charles Robertson, “Proto-Conciliarism in Acts 15,” in “Re-Membering and Re-Imagining.”

²⁵ Valliere, *Conciliarism*, 49, 54.

CONCILIARISM AND THE ECCLESIOLOGY 461
OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

There were equally important ancient international councils at Ephesus and Constantinople. These first seven international gatherings became the epitome of the communitarian, as opposed to the later monarchical, ecclesiology of the ancient Church. Francis Oakley writes:

The characteristic institutional expression of these bonds of communion was the complex pattern of episcopal governance and synodal activity which stands out as so marked a feature of the Church's earliest centuries. And that essentially conciliar mode of governance was to find its culmination at the level of the Universal Church in the great succession of ecumenical councils stretching from Nicaea I (325) to Nicaea II (787).²⁶

Conciliarism is characterized by looking at authoritative representative assemblies as the one reliable means to bring the dominical mandates for unity, new life, and fellowship to the Body of Christ. Paul Valliere believes that the Christian Church in its first millennium actually lived into this concept of government: "... councils answered to the ideal of spiritual unity, and they gave concrete expression to that unity by practicing consensus-based decision-making ... Unity was the first principle of ecclesiology in the ancient Church, and conciliarism was an expression of it."²⁷

²⁶ Oakley, *The Conciliarist Tradition*, 4. See on the ancient ecclesiology of councils Henry Chadwick, "The status of ecumenical councils in Anglican thought," *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, Vol. 195 (1973): 393-408.

²⁷ Valliere, *Conciliarism*, 109.

Canon lawyers, beginning in the twelfth century, looked back to the first millennium and recovered the roots of this ecclesiology in Scripture and in the twelfth-century *Decretum* of Gratian. The *Decretum* was a compilation of over 4,000 texts, decrees, and pronouncements of councils, bishops, and theologians from the earliest times down to 1139. Brian Tierney writes: "... in the *Decretum* of Gratian they found texts attributed to Cyprian, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory the Great which could be used to offset the papal examples, drawn from the early Church."²⁸ By looking back, legal, theological, and spiritual tools had been recovered to rebuild the Church.

But the Conciliar Movement suddenly collapsed when Pope Eugenius IV defeated the conciliarists at the Council of Basel, 1431-1449. The final blow was struck in 1460 when the bull of Pope Pius II, *Execrabilis*, formally proscribed conciliarism as heretical and forbade any appeals from a pope to a future general council.

Historiography of Conciliarism: Brian Tierney

Over the last sixty years, scholars have charted the way from this disaster to the rebirth of conciliarism time after time. Out of a huge literature on this topic I have chosen to focus on five scholars, two who have dealt with Roman Catholicism, four with Anglicanism, or are Anglican scholars.

Francis Oakley refers to Brian Tierney, long-time professor of history at Cornell University, as "the distinguished historian of canon law to whom conciliar studies owe so much."²⁹ On what is

²⁸ Tierney, *Foundations*, 217.

²⁹ Oakley, *The Conciliarist Tradition*, 94.

this great debt based? Walter Ullmann, Tierney's teacher at the University of Cambridge, was typical of World War II-era academics who portrayed the legal technicalities of conciliarism primarily as an eccentric dead-end of history overcome by the triumph of papal absolutism.³⁰ Tierney's classic revision of this point of view is *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory: The Contribution of the Medieval Canonists from Gratian to the Great Schism*.³¹ It came out first in 1955 and new editions appeared until 1998. On one level this is not unlike Ullmann, a technical study of the thought of canon lawyers of the classical age of medieval jurisprudence. But Tierney's book had a larger and much more influential purpose. It was written not to pass judgment but to explain that the conciliarists were not heretics and that their ecclesiology was not a novelty but that it was rooted in ancient orthodoxy.³²

The depth and clarity of the scholarship and the luck of the timing of its publication, the fact that *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory* was published on the eve of the calling of the Second Vatican Council, made all the difference in the world. Tierney's work was a parallel in ecclesiological studies to that of the Liturgical Movement in renewing knowledge of the communal, corporate dimensions of the Church's worship in ages past, as over against that of dominant current hierarchical models. The revival of

³⁰ Walter Ullmann was an Austrian scholar who taught at the University of Cambridge from 1949. His most influential book is *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* (London: Methuen, 1955).

³¹ Latest edition, Brian Tierney, *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory: The Contribution of the Medieval Canonists from Gratian to the Great Schism* (Leiden: Brill, 1998); previous editions 1955 and 1995.

³² Tierney, *Foundations*, 222.

lay participation in the Roman liturgy, which was to be achieved by the Second Vatican Council, was based on the scholarship of the Liturgical Movement grounded in a return to the theology of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ.³³ In a manner that is parallel to the liturgists, Tierney understood the primary achievement of *Foundations* to be the convincing demonstration of “the gradual assimilation into canonistic theory of the ancient doctrine of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ, with a consequent fusion between the theological concept of mystical Unity in the Church and the juristic idea of legal incorporation.”³⁴

Francis Oakley

Francis Oakley, a professor of history and former President of Williams College, continued in the footsteps of Brian Tierney and expanded the scope of his coverage of conciliarism into the early twenty-first century. This is seen above all in Oakley’s final book: *The Conciliarist Tradition: Constitutionalism in the Catholic Church 1300-1870*, published in 2003, a year Oakley defines as “a moment of deepening crisis in the authority structures of the Western, Latin, or Roman Catholic Church.”³⁵ Writing in the midst of this concern about the stability of the Western Church, Oakley makes

³³ I discuss the parallel revival of a communitarian understanding of the Church in Roman Catholicism and in Anglican liturgical renewal in my book, R. W. Franklin, *Nineteenth-Century Churches: The History of a New Catholicism in Wurttemberg, England, and France* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1987).

³⁴ Tierney, *Foundations*, 222.

³⁵ Francis Oakley, *The Conciliarist Tradition: Constitutionalism in the Catholic Church 1300-1870* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), vii. An extensive bibliography of Oakley’s twenty books and articles on this topic can be found on pages 281-282 of this book.

CONCILIARISM AND THE ECCLESIOLOGY 465
OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

the case that, five hundred years after *Execrabilis* of 1460, conciliarism survived in various forms within the Roman Catholic Church. He summarizes his findings: "...tattered remnants of that conciliar ecclesiology were to be found caught up in those provincial, obscurely subversive and usually statist ideologies that have come down in history as Gallicanism, Richerism, Febronianism, and Josephism."³⁶

What is significant for our subject of connecting conciliarism to The Episcopal Church's General Convention is that all of these Roman Catholic movements used the ecclesiology of conciliarism to defend the authority of national church bodies. Gallicanism, for example, asserted the freedoms of the national Church of France (the *libertés de l'Église*) from unilateral interventions by the papacy. It was based on the conciliarist ecclesiology as articulated by a French theologian, Jean Gerson (1363-1429) and a French cardinal, Pierre d'Ailly (1350-1420) who both had taken part in the Council of Constance. It was expanded further by Edmond Richer (1559-1631) who advanced the authority of national councils. Gallicanism asserted the superiority of a General Council over the pope, and the participation of theologians as well as bishops in authoritative national councils. From 1682 Gallicanism was officially supported by the French Church, it was taught in the French seminaries, and continued to flourish down to the eve of the French Revolution when its principles were officially sanctioned by the Synod of Pistoia in 1786.

Febronianism was a counterpart to Gallicanism in the German states and in the Holy Roman Empire. In 1736 a bishop in

³⁶ Oakley, *The Conciliarist Tradition*, 16.

Trier, J.N. von Hontheim, published *De statu ecclesiae* under the name of "Febronius." Febronianism subjected the papal primacy to the oversight of General Councils. It gave authority to the regional councils of the archbishop-electors of the German states. Not surprisingly it received the backing of the archbishop-electors (who were also secular rulers) who produced a manifesto against papal claims within their tiny territories. "Josephism" was the practical restriction on the papacy within the governmental units of the Holy Roman Empire under the emperor Joseph II from 1765 to 1790.

These surviving northern European Roman Catholic conciliarist strands were wiped out once again by the triumph of the concept of a now infallible papal monarchy at the First Vatican Council in 1870. But the story of Catholic conciliarism still did not come to an end. Oakley shows that during the 1950s and the 1960s (the run-up to the Second Vatican Council), in the scholarship of Tierney and that of the Liturgical Movement "...it is certainly true that the return to scriptural, patristic, and historical sources that was to characterize so much Catholic theology in the twentieth century did promote a resulting recognition of the centrality to the Church's governance in its earliest centuries of episcopal collegueship and conciliar activity."³⁷

So, in fact, the ecclesiology of *communio* was indeed revived and became momentarily influential in the Roman Catholic Church in the era of the Second Vatican Council. However, Oakley comes to the conclusion that in the 1960's "a few attempts were made to draw attention to the relevance of the conciliarists' position and to its appeal as a viable ecclesiological option. But

³⁷ Oakley, *The Conciliarist Tradition*, 10.

these attempts met with no success, and the tradition of conciliarist constitutionalism receded once more to its established status as a fragile counter-memory lingering on the very margins of theological concern, or at most, as a minor perturbation in the outermost orbit of the ecclesiastical consciousness."³⁸

*Conciliarism in Anglicanism and in
The Episcopal Church: Raymond Albright*

I have inserted this discussion of Roman Catholic scholarship and its discovery of parallel developments to our own into our discussion because this scholarship has been a resource, and the parallels have much to teach us in an Anglican discussion on the continuing influence of conciliarism upon our Communion. As an example of this, I review now the work of four Anglican scholars: Raymond Albright, Gillian Evans, Ephraim Radner, and Paul Valliere.

Raymond Albright, in his seminal article "Conciliarism in Anglicanism," narrates the very complex process by which the theories of conciliarism survived in and shape the evolution of Anglicanism into our own time, just as Francis Oakley demonstrates a similar pattern in the Roman Catholic Church. The theories of conciliarism buttressed the granting of authority over the Church of England to the monarch and to the English parliament in the sixteenth century. At the conclusion of the

³⁸ Oakley, *The Conciliarist Tradition*, 18. In the Second Vatican Council's *Constitution on the Church, Lumen gentium*, Oakley describes this failure again of conciliarism: "The ecclesiology of jurisdiction, or rather that of Vatican I, and the still older and now rediscovered ecclesiology of *communion* are placed side by side but remain unconnected." (p. 11).

American War of Independence and America's breaking of political ties with Britain, Albright shows that this English conciliarist model of church government was successfully translated into the new republican context of the United States by the creation of the General Convention of The Episcopal Church. Albright reaches this conclusion: "In all these steps and in its subsequent legislation through the last 175 years this church, like the Church of England, has respected its heritage, has recognized its common background, and has stood in the conciliar tradition dependent on the canon law and constitutions adopted from the beginning of conciliar proceedings....The evidence is cumulative and convincing that both the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church have in intention, in legislation, and in usage and practice continued the conciliar principle which has been in force in the Church from the earliest centuries."³⁹

To Albright there were two "steps" in this evolution. First, as Henry VIII moved the Church of England out from under the absolute monarchy of the papacy in the 1530s, he was attracted to the conciliarists' revival of the ideal of an emperor presiding over a council as an alternate and valid model of church government. As the Emperor Constantine had assembled and played a key role at the Council of Nicaea, and as the Holy Roman Emperor Sigismund had done the same at the Council of Constance a century before the Reformation, so Henry understood his authority and that of the English parliament over the church to be based on this previous conciliarist pattern.

Albright shows with detail and precision how acts of the 1540's fused the legal authority of church and state and

³⁹ Raymond W. Albright, "Conciliarism in Anglicanism," *Church History*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (March 1964): 3-22; 21, 20, 21.

CONCILIARISM AND THE ECCLESIOLOGY 469
OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

introduced into canon law the essential elements of English common law procedure. The two convocations of the clergy in England were placed under the absolute authority of monarch and parliament, as church law was subsumed into the national law of the English state.

Conciliarist theories of the Church as a communal corporation and the medieval canon lawyers' ideal of the legal incorporation of church affairs into the law of the nation supported this evolution. Through this process of the incorporation of conciliarism the English parliament came to be understood as a church council. The bishops made up part of the Upper House of parliament. Lay members of the Church of England sat in the Lower House and shared in the authority of the state exercised over ecclesiastical affairs. Albright sees these developments as part of a national-level conciliarism which also appeared in France and in the German states: "In England the Parliament regulates not only the civil and political life of the country, but, since the Church of England is the established church, it legislates for the church as well and in doing so assumes part of the function performed by the ancient church councils. Following the Reformation the Church law enforced in England was modified from time to time by Parliamentary action which altered or modified papal codes still in force in England."⁴⁰

As step two of his argument Albright shows that the modern constitutional and canonical structures of The Episcopal Church are ultimately rooted and shaped by this sixteenth-century Reformation incorporation of church into state. Albright writes of

⁴⁰ Albright, *Conciliarism in Anglicanism*, 9-10.

The Episcopal Church: "Its legal structure is specifically based upon the Canon Law of the Church of England and both in its canons and its constitution it has preserved the dependence upon continuous conciliar procedure and the intention to abide by the purpose of the historical church of which it is a part."⁴¹ This process happened in the New World in the English colonies of New York, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia because Anglican parishes there were a part of the English state church. Ultimately the English monarch and parliament possessed sovereign authority over these American parishes, and the parishes were a part of this legal structure.

Raymond Albright shows that following the American Revolution, after a series of three conventions in the 1780s, the constitution and canons for the newly independent Protestant Episcopal Church were promulgated by 1789. This achievement was guided above all by William White of Philadelphia, later to be the first Bishop of Pennsylvania and Presiding Bishop. In *The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered* (1782), White sketched out his idea of the Church as a corporation governed by representative conventions. He gave American and republican expression to the conciliarists' concept of ultimate authority over the Church vested in a convention (council) made up of the elected representatives of the *congregatio fidelium*—elected (not appointed) bishops, priests, and laity. White saw this role of the laity to be nothing new but rather in continuity with the conciliar tradition. Albright says of this: "The introduction of laymen into the government of the Church was hardly an innovation, but rather the restoration of a very ancient principle in

⁴¹ Albright, *Conciliarism in Anglicanism*, 14.

CONCILIARISM AND THE ECCLESIOLOGY 471
OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

conciliar history....William White very early showed enthusiasm for this practice in the Episcopal Church since his studies in the early church convinced him that the laity were represented in the ancient ecclesiastical synods."⁴²

In 1782 when White published his *Case* there were no bishops in America. He later incorporated bishops consecrated into the historic line of succession into a separate house of the General Convention. White was one of three who sailed to England and Scotland for consecration into the historic episcopal succession, which he considered a necessary link outside of the United States to ensure the validity of the General Convention's authority. The adaptation of conciliarism to American republicanism was White's greatest achievement. In this Albright stresses continuity rather than innovation: "These differences [from the Church of England], however, were entirely procedural and were not designated to separate the church from the episcopal government and conciliar procedures in the earlier church....This unqualified pledge to continue what the English Church had always been and done included the perpetuation of the conciliar idea and practice as well as the historic episcopate."⁴³

Gillian R. Evans

Another seminal article which demonstrates the themes of complexity, continuity, and transformation in relating conciliar ecclesiology to Anglicanism is "Anglican Conciliar Theory: Provincial Autonomy and the Present Crisis," by Gillian R. Evans,

⁴² Albright, *Conciliarism in Anglicanism*, 17.

⁴³ Albright, *Conciliarism in Anglicanism*, 17-18.

a lecturer in history at the University of Cambridge.⁴⁴ The title sums up the article's purpose and conclusion. "The present crisis" is the threat to the unity of the Anglican Communion posed by the 1988 election of Barbara C. Harris as the first woman bishop by one province, The Episcopal Church, without consensus having been reached on the issue by the other provinces. The larger issue of the crisis was that of provincial autonomy. How can one national Church act alone, and by what authority? Evans cites "Anglican conciliar theory" as the source which made possible such an action. She writes: "...Anglican provincial autonomy is a function of a synodical or conciliar pattern of Church government....it depends ultimately upon the Communion's sense of its heritage of conciliar theory and practice."⁴⁵

Evans makes available for the study of Anglicanism what Oakley provides for Roman Catholicism, a demonstration of conciliarism as a heritage of ecclesiology which links a current crisis to five hundred years of an on-going development. Of her purpose she says: "I have attempted ... an outline of this history; in which is embedded a theology with, it must be admitted, a number of loose ends."⁴⁶ She divides this history into four epochs.

The first is "The sixteenth century," divided into two parts, covering the Articles and theologians. Her analysis of Article 21 of the Thirty-Nine Articles finds that it "speaks only of General Councils," called by secular rulers (the source of their validity)

⁴⁴ Gillian R. Evans, "Anglican Conciliar Theory: Provincial Autonomy and the Present Crisis," *One in Christ*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (1989): 34-52.

⁴⁵ Evans, "Anglican Conciliar Theory," 35.

⁴⁶ Evans, "Anglican Conciliar Theory," 34.

CONCILIARISM AND THE ECCLESIOLOGY 473
OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

and thought not to be infallible.⁴⁷ According to the Articles, the purposes of General Councils are to preserve unity and condemn heresies. In part two she finds that leading sixteenth-century Anglican theologians (Jewel, Tyndale, Cranmer, Whitaker, Philpot) looked in a variety of ways at many aspects of General Councils, their validity, representative nature, authority, universality, and the fact that an individual's faith can be bound by a council only if its decisions can be supported by Scripture: "These commonplaces of conciliar function were matters on which everyone could agree."⁴⁸

In section two, "The seventeenth to nineteenth century," she turns to the question of the authority of national councils which is at the heart of this exploration of the ecclesiology of General Convention. Her focus here is on the defense of national councils by William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1633 to 1645. She writes, "William Laud's Conference with Fisher the Jesuit in 1622 represents a new departure because Laud gave serious thought to the question of the powers of independent action of provincial or national synods representing only part of the Universal Church."⁴⁹ Laud's argument is that if an emergency arises in a specific national Church and it is not possible to call a General Council, then parts of the Universal Church may call national or provincial councils which are valid gatherings to make authoritative decisions concerning national Churches. Laud's

⁴⁷ Evans, "Anglican Conciliar Theory," 35.

⁴⁸ Evans, "Anglican Conciliar Theory," 38.

⁴⁹ Evans, "Anglican Conciliar Theory," 31. This crucial *Conference* is contained within the Oxford edition of Laud's *Works*.

national conciliarism was contemporary with and similar to the Gallicanism of the Church of France.⁵⁰

In parts Three and Four, "Not a Council but a Conference" and "The Twentieth Century," Evans shows that in the nineteenth century the creators of the Lambeth Conferences and in the twentieth century the attending bishops themselves continued this Laudian *per partes* tradition of national provincial authority and did not consider the Lambeth Conferences to be General Councils at all. At the first Lambeth Conference in 1867 Archbishop of Canterbury Charles Longley said: "It has never been contemplated that we should assume the function of a general synod of all the Churches in full communion with the Church of England, and take upon ourselves to enact canons that should be binding upon those here represented."⁵¹

Lambeth Conferences of the twentieth century stood by this principle of provincial authority for national councils. A committee of the 1920 Lambeth Conference reported that "each National or Regional Church or Province would necessarily determine its own constitutional and canonical enactments."⁵² The Lambeth Conference of 1930 discussed two types of ecclesiastical organization, "that of centralized government and that of regional autonomy," available to world families of Churches.⁵³ The Anglican Communion was said to have a government of

⁵⁰ Evans also considers the arguments of theologian Herbert Thorndike (1598-1672) who believed no "part" of the Universal Church can take an action which threatens the unity of the larger Church, and that defending the rights of "independent" Churches leads to schism.

⁵¹ Evans, "Anglican Conciliar Theory," 46.

⁵² Evans, "Anglican Conciliar Theory," 49-50.

⁵³ Evans, "Anglican Conciliar Theory," 50.

provincial authorities. And the 1930 Conference said further that “the right of Provinces to consecrate bishops without reference to authorities exterior to the Provinces has often been regarded as ...essential...to the forming of a Province.”⁵⁴

But the 1988 Lambeth Conference marked a turning away from a sole reliance on the *per partes* tradition, and its Resolution of August 1, 1988, called for a collective discussion of the continued viability of *per partes* conciliarism.⁵⁵ The 1988 Resolution asked the question of what happens when a province acts so independently as to become an absent and separate Church. Evans sees this as a turning point in the history of Anglican conciliarism: “At the 1988 Lambeth Conference the right to independence began to be seriously weighed against the duty to act with catholic intention in a manner not envisaged as being divisive in relation to other communities.”⁵⁶ The scale of this emerging 1988 crisis is seen by Gillian Evans to be as large as those which led to the major councils of the early Church, and in the light of Lambeth 1988, she called for a re-evaluation of the prevailing ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion.

Ephraim Radner: Conciliarism and Disunity

In his articles in response to my two essays on conciliarism in *The Living Church* in 2011, Ephraim Radner, professor of historical theology at Wycliffe College of the University of Toronto, called

⁵⁴ Evans, “Anglican Conciliar Theory,” 51-52.

⁵⁵ Lambeth Conference Resolution of August 1, 1988, in *One in Christ*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (1989): 25-26.

⁵⁶ Evans, “Anglican Conciliar Theory,” 52.

for a deeper critique and examination of the background for the claims of authority of the General Convention. Radner provides this major critical review in *A Brutal Unity: The Spiritual Politics of the Christian Church*, published in 2012.⁵⁷ *A Brutal Unity* breaks new ground in our contemporary debate about conciliarism because of its focus on the ecclesiology of *disunity*, rather than unity.⁵⁸

Radner describes his purpose in these words: “Failure to confront Christian division is not simply the evasion of a task, or the setting aside of one from a number of possible Christian tasks; it is an immoral act in and of itself ... division has always been a religious concern, and not simply an organizational one ... There has been little theological interest in ecclesial division in modern times ...”⁵⁹ It is within this context of what Radner refers to as “eristology,” the study of discord in the church, that Radner conducts his detailed examination of conciliarism, and finds much that is positive: “Indeed, the conciliar model was generally informed by an intrinsic pastoral mission focused on the temporal out-working of individual ministries, liked the bishop’s. This pastoral impetus, however, was always seen as ordered in a synodical, or conciliar, form.”⁶⁰

Radner’s book is the story of the constant Christian search for

⁵⁷ Ephraim Radner, *A Brutal Unity: The Spiritual Politics of the Christian Church* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2012).

⁵⁸ A major work on the ecclesiology of unity, rather than disunity is Lorelei F. Fuchs, *Koinonia and the Quest for an Ecumenical Ecclesiology: From Foundations Through Dialogue to Symbolic Competence for Communionality* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008).

⁵⁹ Radner, *A Brutal Unity*, 462, 4, 3.

⁶⁰ Radner, *A Brutal Unity*, 243.

agreement, and the hindrance to such agreement. There are great models for this. He gives us a detailed account of the supreme model of a community coming to agreement in the Acts 15 account of the Council of Jerusalem. He finds conciliarism to be one attractive model of agreement considered as a possibility by Henry VIII at the beginning of the English Reformation, streaming on in as varied places as English Puritanism, and French Gallicanism, down to the French Revolution. He reminds us of "the critical influence of conciliarism in the development of early modern (and modern) constitutional ideas".⁶¹ He notes the lure toward conciliarism in Roman Catholic theologians of the era of the Second Vatican Council, and the revived interest in it in the scholarly journals of the last sixty years.

But what is new is Radner's significant concern about the methods sometimes used in councils to secure "a brutal unity." Let me cite three examples he explores concerning the potential "brutal unity" of councils and commentators on the methods of councils in the past. First, he provides us the conclusions of the scholarship of Ramsay MacMullen in *Voting About God in Early Church Councils*, published in 2006.⁶² In a balanced work of detailed scholarship, MacMullen raises the question of how human, political, emotional, and base motives at times may have

⁶¹ Radner, *A Brutal Unity*, 286. He discusses the great work in this area of secular constitutionalism related to conciliarism in the work of John Neville Figgis, *Studies of Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius: 1414-1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907), and he reviews the scholarship of Tierney, Oakley, and Antony Black on the influence of conciliarism on secular constitutionalism

⁶² Ramsay MacMullen, *Voting about God in Early Church Councils* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006).

shaped conciliar decisions. I believe that Radner's descriptions of Ramsay's critical analysis of decision-making by early councils may be for the purpose of asking us to raise similar questions about how modern councils operate:

In addition, MacMullen has analyzed the procedural orchestration of councils in a way that discloses carefully determined, if entirely predictable, attainment of outcome: controlling agendas, suppressing speech, organizing caucuses and manipulating factions, communicating threats, dividing duties, and secreting elite decision making behind closed doors ... MacMullen properly attempts to avoid reducing conciliar agreement to coercion, or 'violence' ... Instead, he takes seriously the intentions and motivations of participants, categorizing these broadly into three other aspects: the cognitive, the supernatural, and the democratic ... it was just this motivated and invested importance that turned councils into arenas of more contested and coercive striving: the 'cognitive' was easily transformed into the 'emotive'; the supernatural substance was easily aimed at a demonized opponent; the consent of the 'people' turned into a demand only for (achievable) assent, however produced ... the very meaning of Christian agreement becomes the undoing of its accomplishment.⁶³

⁶³Radner, *A Brutal Unity*, 243.

CONCILIARISM AND THE ECCLESIOLOGY 479
OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

Radner makes the case that the methods of brutal unity were also a factor in turning both Martin Luther and John Calvin away from councils as effective instruments of reformed authority, and turned them toward the authority in the church of the secular magistrate, and of Holy Scripture, instead of councils. Radner shows that Luther makes use of a similar critique to that of MacMullen in his *On the Councils and the Church* of 1539, and John Calvin does so as well in his edition of the *Institutes of Christian Religion*, also of 1539:

Luther quotes [Pope] Gregory [the Great] with gusto in his 1539 *On the Councils and the Church* using the latter's general criticism of councils as things to "flee" for their combustible gathering of individuals driven by ambition and self-regard, as a reason to brand even Chalcedon as a meeting filled with 'arguing' and selfish and useless commotion. Likewise, Calvin turns to Gregory as well, at the end of a long discussion of the relative values of councils (*Institutes* IV.9.9-11), filled as they are and have been with quarrelling and jealous and simply erroneous human machinations. Both Luther and Calvin use these realities of complex (and sinful) human relations at work within Christian councils to subvert the intrinsic authority of conciliar decisions. For both, only Scripture can found a truthful and authoritative ecclesial decision, and councils themselves are neither guaranteed pneumatic direction, nor does

history convince us that many even received it.⁶⁴

The struggle for Christian communities to come to agreement has been a part of our history from the beginning. Radner's book reminds us that the complexities of human nature have always been present, and often a negative hindrance, in the process leading toward agreement. Or, as Henry Chadwick writes, "Human nature being what it is, disagreement was a normal condition in a diocese..."⁶⁵ And in Lincoln's phrase, "the better angels of our nature" have not always been present. From this negative perspective conciliarism does have a checkered history at best and we are not surprised that those frustrated with it in the past, have turned to a secular magistrate or a papal monarch as an alternate mode of authority. Radner's review of the history and literature of the brutal side of unity, of eristology, and of the human factors that through each age have wounded the efforts of councils must be taken seriously as any future review of the governance structures of The Episcopal Church progresses.

Paul Valliere

Paul Valliere, a professor of history at Emory University, published *Conciliarism: A History of Decision-Making in the Church*, also in 2012. Like the studies of Oakley and Evans, his history once again is written against the background of a crisis, the 2003 consecration of an openly gay and partnered bishop in The Episcopal Church. Valliere locates the origins of this crisis

⁶⁴ Radner, *A Brutal Unity*, 241-242.

⁶⁵ Henry Chadwick, *Augustine of Hippo: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 62.

precisely within the topic under consideration. He asks: "What was the outcome of the conciliarism practiced by the General Conventions of 2003 and 2006? Nothing less than the largest schism in the history of The Episcopal Church."⁶⁶ The purpose of his book is a recounting of the entire history of conciliarism so that "the domestic conciliar institutions of The Episcopal Church must be reconstituted so that church can be reunified ... Our study of conciliarism suggests both a destination and a perspective on how to get there."⁶⁷ (The destination he has in mind is a "reunion council" between The Episcopal Church and the separated Anglican bodies in North America.)

Valliere's chapter two, "The Conciliar Tradition," is a complete review of the origin and expansion of the influence of councils in the patristic Church which resulted in the creation of what he calls "conciliar spirituality," with which he defines the continuing governance of both national and international councils all through the subsequent evolution of Church history. For Valliere, for each epoch conciliar spirituality means, "Decision-making is a spiritual act, and decision-making procedures always reflect a spiritual culture."⁶⁸ Councils were the great contribution of the patristic Church to the future because "...councils answered to the ideal of spiritual unity, and they gave concrete expression to that unity by practicing consensus-based decision-making."⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Paul Valliere, *Conciliarism: A History of Decision-Making in the Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 226.

⁶⁷ Valliere, *Conciliarism*, 228.

⁶⁸ Valliere, *Conciliarism*, 104.

⁶⁹ Valliere, *Conciliarism*, 109.

Valliere's chapter three, "The Conciliar Theory," is a similar treatment of the whole history of the revival of conciliarism in the Middle Ages through the Council of Constance. The Council of Constance is treated as of the greatest importance because it was able to move conciliarism from a spiritual theory to the articulation of a distinct theology of Church government which becomes foundational for the future. The Council of Constance, in the following passage from its decree *Haec sancta*, gives a theological definition of the authority of councils in which each word will be of significance for the future:

First it [the Council of Constance] declares that legitimately assembled in the Holy Spirit, constituting a general council and representing the catholic Church militant, it has power immediately from Christ; and that everyone of whatever state or dignity, even papal, is bound to obey it in these matters which pertain to the faith, the eradication of the said schism and the general reform of the said church of God in head and members.⁷⁰

Valliere's chapter four focuses on the survival of this theology throughout the waxing and waning of its influence throughout the whole history of Anglicanism. He, like Raymond Albright, is convinced that "the tradition continued in the political conciliarism embodied in the English Parliament."⁷¹ This parliamentary conciliarism is defended by John Jewel, the Bishop of Salisbury

⁷⁰ Valliere, *Conciliarism*, 144.

⁷¹ Valliere, *Conciliarism*, 166.

CONCILIARISM AND THE ECCLESIOLOGY 483
OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

from 1559 to 1571: "Jewel saw the English Church as practicing a healthy conciliarism. He insisted on the conciliar character of the Elizabethan settlement."⁷² In one of the earliest works of Anglican ecclesiology, *An Apology of the Church of England* (1562), Bishop Jewel says: "Yet truly we do not despise councils....The matter hath been treated in open parliament, with long consultation and before a notable synod and convocation."⁷³ Similarly, Richard Hooker supported the revival of councils in the Church of England as way to insure lay participation in the governance of the Church. Hooker defends this practice and the regular calling of councils in *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1594, 1597) as "a thing where of God's own blessed Spirit was the author...."⁷⁴

⁷² Valliere, *Conciliarism*, 169.

⁷³ Valliere, *Conciliarism*, 169.

⁷⁴ Quoted in Valliere, *Conciliarism*, 172. The passage is worth quoting at length: "For as one and the same law divine, whereof in the next place we are to speak, is unto all Christian churches a rule for the chiefest things; by means whereof they all in that respect make one church, as having all but "one Lord, one faith, and one baptism:" so the urgent necessity of mutual communion for preservation of our unity in these things, as also for order in some other things convenient to be every where uniformly kept, maketh it requisite that the Church of God here on earth have her laws of spiritual commerce between Christian nations; laws by virtue whereof all churches may enjoy freely the use of those reverend, religious, and sacred consultations, which are termed Councils General. A thing whereof God's own blessed Spirit was the author; a thing practised by the holy Apostles themselves; a thing always afterwards kept and observed throughout the world; a thing never otherwise than most highly esteemed of, till pride, ambition, and tyranny began by factious and vile endeavours to abuse that divine invention unto the furtherance of wicked purposes. But as the just authority of civil courts and parliaments is not therefore to be abolished, because sometime there is cunning used to frame them according to the private intents of men over potent in the commonwealth; so the grievous abuse which hath been of councils should rather cause men to study how so gracious a thing may again be reduced to that

Valliere is brief in his treatment of the continuity and triumph of Anglican “conciliar spirituality” in the creation of the General Convention, though he notes “that the Episcopal Church in America has preferred not to speak of itself in the idiom of ...conciliarism.”⁷⁵ In this passage he addresses key themes of this present review of the literature:

The revival of conciliarism in the English Church tradition did not begin with decisions made in England but with the emergence of Anglican Churches abroad, beginning with the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States at the end of the eighteenth century. Conciliarism sprang from the need to create structures of local church government to replace collapsed or impractical arrangements for ecclesiastical oversight from England ... The Protestant Episcopal Church was constituted as self-governing, juridically subject to no external authority, sacred or secular....presiding bishops were not elected at all; the office simply devolved on the senior member of the episcopate.⁷⁶

I conclude my consideration of Valliere with a mention of his brief section “The New Ecclesiology,” which comes just before his consideration of the Lambeth Conferences. Like Francis Oakley, he observes a marked revival of interest in conciliarism almost

first perfection,” (Laws, Book I.x.14; Keble edition)

⁷⁵ Valliere, *Conciliarism*, 177.

⁷⁶ Valliere, *Conciliarism*, 176-177.

simultaneously in the first half of the nineteenth century in many world families of Churches. This was part of a new and widespread interest in the Christian ideal of community in opposition to the rising and dominant cultural dynamic of individualism which was a part of the epoch of the democratic and industrial revolutions. The nineteenth-century revival of the liturgy in many countries which led on to the Liturgical Movement was part of this, and Valliere notes, "The recovery of conciliarist ideas was another aspect of the nineteenth-century ecclesiological revival."⁷⁷

A return to patristic conciliarism as a response to secular revolutionary challenges to Christianity is addressed in his 1825 *The Unity of the Church* by the German Roman Catholic ecclesiologist Johann Adam Möhler, and it is a component of the movement led by the Danish ecclesiologist N.F.S. Grundtvig leading to the reconstitution of the Church of Denmark in 1849. In addition, a return to the patristic understanding of the role of councils in the government of the Church was also part of the Anglican catholic revival of the Oxford Movement, above all in the 1857 volume of E. B. Pusey, *The Councils in the Church from the Council of Jerusalem A.D. 51, to the Council of Constantinople A.D. 381*. A revival of councils was important to Pusey, but at the same time he was deeply and publicly critical of the participation of the laity as authoritative deputies who formed a part of the General Convention of the American Episcopal Church. Pusey believed that councils should be made up of bishops alone.⁷⁸

⁷⁷ Valliere, *Conciliarism*, 183.

⁷⁸ I discuss the links and connections of Möhler and Pusey in my *Nineteenth-*

Conclusion

I close with this reference to E. B. Pusey because he greatly influenced Charles C. Grafton, an American bishop whose thoughts on the General Convention are relevant to yet another crisis that our generation of bishops faces in The Episcopal Church today, and with which I wish to close this review.⁷⁹

After serving as Rector of the Church of the Advent in Boston for sixteen years, Charles Grafton was elected as the second Bishop of Fond du Lac in Wisconsin, in November 1888. He arrived in his diocese to find that, out of thirty-three clergy, only eighteen were actively engaged in ministry. Twenty parishes or missions were without clergy. In the whole diocese only nine parishes were self-supporting, and forty-odd were at mission status and needed support. Fond du Lac's cathedral was forlorn following a terrible fire. There were clear reasons for this

Century Churches: The History of a New Catholicism in Württemberg, England, and France (1987). I discuss the links and connections of Möhler, Pusey, and Grundtvig in R. William Franklin and Joseph M. Shaw, *The Case for Christian Humanism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 140-176, 206-225.

⁷⁹ Another recent key survey of conciliarism in Anglicanism is Paul Avis, *Beyond the Reformation? Authority, Primacy, and Unity in the Conciliar Tradition* (London: T and T Clark, 2006). Avis provides more documentation to make the case that the "English Reformers were closer to the Conciliarists than has generally been thought." Avis suggests a solution to current problems of the Anglican Communion by giving the conciliar authority of the Lambeth Conferences a "constitutional expression." Paul Avis also discusses conciliarism in his most recent book, *Becoming a Bishop: Theological Handbook of Episcopal Ministry* (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015). This work is distinctive because it locates the theological foundation of conciliarism in baptism. By virtue of baptism "all Christians are incorporated into Jesus Christ's threefold messianic identity as prophet, priest, and king." (56). Anglicans affirm that because they share in the Royal Priesthood of Jesus "all the baptized are mandated to play their part in the governance of Christ's Kingdom." (56).

disaster. Bishop Grafton wrote that “poverty was everywhere.”⁸⁰ The diocese was in a region of economic decline. Lumber barons had built up small towns and paid for and run their small Episcopal churches. But the timber barons departed taking their money and leaving behind poverty. Belgian and Czech immigrant labor had been imported into many small towns to work cutting the wood and in the lumber mills. But the immigrant population could hardly cope when the lumber jobs moved. The result of all of this was that there was little or no tradition of Christian faith or stewardship left. Grafton wrote, “The duty and privilege of giving to God, in the way of supporting His Church, was little appreciated.”⁸¹ What Grafton faced describes the economic and demographic decline faced by many dioceses of The Episcopal Church today, the context in which the Church is being asked to “re-imagine” and “re-think” its governance structures today. Above all Bishop Grafton speaks to our time because he, like us, “realized the Church needs to go to those on the margins of society and not expect them to come

⁸⁰ Charles C. Grafton, *A Journey Godward of a Servant of Jesus Christ* (Milwaukee: Young Churchman, 1910), 154. The ideas in this section were first presented by me in two lectures, “Bishop Grafton and the Identity of The Episcopal Church in the Twenty-First Century,” first at the Cathedral of St. Paul, Fond du Lac in August 2013, and then at Nashotah House Seminary in February 2014. Portions of these lectures appeared as “Bishop Grafton and the 21st-Century Church,” in *The Living Church*, Vol. 248, No. 10, May 25, 2014, 9-12,; and as “The Bishop’s Identity and Tasks,” in Paul Avis, *Becoming a Bishop*, “Cameos and Related Additional Material,” (<http://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/becoming-a-bishop-9780567657275/>, and select online resources tab). I want to thank Canon Matthew P. Payne, Archivist and Historiographer of the Diocese of Fond du Lac, for his extensive advice and counsel on preparing these lectures and adapting them as articles.

⁸¹ Grafton, *A Journey Godward*, 163.

to church for help—an insight as true in the twenty-first century as in the nineteenth.”⁸²

The ecclesiology that most influenced Grafton in seeking to express this missional identity of the Church for the new context of an industrial, democratic society was that of E. B. Pusey. As one of the three leaders of the Oxford Movement, Pusey took many actions from 1833 to 1882 to express a recovered communal dimension of Anglicanism through a revival of Eucharistic worship linked to a campaign for building parish churches in the new industrial cities of England, the re-establishment of religious orders in the Anglican Communion, and a return to conciliarism as the necessary model of church government for such a social context.⁸³

Following the American Civil War, Grafton traveled to England, where he remained until 1870. He is best known for founding the Society of St. John the Evangelist, the Cowley Fathers, during these years along with Richard M. Benson and Simeon O’Neill, which was a direct expression of this revived Christian communalism of Puseyism. But Grafton also went to England to learn the missional model of Puseyism for the parishes, particularly its Christian social side of creating communities of justice for those on the margins of society, which he believed to be a new and effective purpose for the parish church in an industrial, democratic society. The revival of the catholic dimension of the liturgy was a necessary part of this mission. (He also brought Old Catholic Belgian and Czech parishes into the Episcopal Church and allowed them liturgical variations).

⁸² Eldridge H. Pendleton, SSJE, *Press on, the Kingdom* (Cambridge: The Society of St. John the Evangelist, 2014), 175.

⁸³ I discuss the communal dimension of Puseyism in my article, “Pusey and Worship in Industrial Society,” *Worship*, Vol. 57, No. 5 (1983): 386-411.

CONCILIARISM AND THE ECCLESIOLOGY 489
OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

Both of these, the revival of monasticism and the revival of the catholic tradition of the liturgy in parishes, were brought to Fond du Lac and adapted to an American, Midwestern setting. Likewise, Grafton followed Pusey's call for the revival of conciliarism. But this revival of conciliarism had also to speak to American society and culture. Grafton did this by clearly and specifically defending the authoritative role of the General Convention as continuing in the New World the apostolic heritage of church government. Grafton wrote:

In the Anglican Church I heard a living Voice, declaring the ancient Faith, and possessed of the priesthood, the Sacraments, and the ancient worship of the Church. Thus I was led to adopt these two principles for my religious guidance. I believed wholly in Christ ... and in His Church, because it was the living organism through which He spoke and communicated Himself to us.⁸⁴

Unlike Pusey, who was negative concerning the authoritative role of the laity in the General Convention and the General Convention itself, Grafton comes to the defense of our General Convention as a valuable adaptation of apostolic conciliar practice to the specific missional needs of the modern Church. In his *Addresses and Sermons* (published in a collection in 1914) Grafton's defense of the General Convention encompasses five points:

⁸⁴Grafton, *A Journey Godward*, 59.

1. The Government of The Episcopal Church is Apostolic and Balanced:

Another characteristic of our Church is seen in her government and the balanced distribution of powers of her officers. To say she is an Episcopal Church gives but a very superficial account of her organization. There are Episcopal Churches and Episcopal Churches ... If we look at the Mother Church of Jerusalem, which gave the type to which the Church in her growth naturally conformed, we find there a locally resident and presiding Apostle or Bishop, St. James, a body of Elders or Ministers of a second or subordinate order, and also a number of deacons. Here too the Apostles representing the whole Church assembled in council, and the decrees they made ran in the name of no one as Supreme, but of all the Apostles, elders, and brethren. We find here the principle of the solidarity of the apostolate, and the coordinated authority of the several orders of the ministry.⁸⁵

2. The Conciliarism of the Government of The Episcopal Church Insures this Balanced Form of Authority that Modern Society Needs:

⁸⁵ Charles C. Grafton, *Addresses and Sermons* (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1914), 412-414.

There is a double tendency respecting governmental powers found in human society and in all nations: one to the centralization of authority in a single head; one to its distribution among the people ... In the Church, the one expresses itself in Papalism, the other in Congregationalism ... So between the dangers of the two extremes, of Papal centralization ... and on the other hand, of individualism with its rationalist rejection of authority and traditional government and worship, the Church preserves with balanced wisdom all her inherited powers in due and regulated subordination to each other, under Christ, her living and ever-present Head.⁸⁶

3. The Apostolic Heritage of Conciliarism in the General Convention Combines for the Future the Best of a Variety of Church Polities, and Thereby Leads to Unity:

If we examine the government, we see the Church is not thus under an absolute monarch, but has her own free government, in which the rights of the clergy and laity and bishops are preserved. She combines in herself the advantages of the Congregational,

⁸⁶ Grafton, *Addresses and Sermons*, 413-414.

Presbyterian, and Episcopal systems, and the latter, thus modified, has come down to us from Apostolic times.⁸⁷

4. The General Convention As It Is Constituted Makes Possible the Collective Authority of the Bishops to be Made Manifest:

[The Episcopal Church] believes that the government of the Church is vested in the bishops and those under them. No one bishop is independent of the others. His authority lies in his being a true exponent of the whole body of the episcopate. We believe thus in the solidarity of the Episcopate. The authority that lies behind the individual bishop is the corporate knowledge and consciousness of the whole undivided Church.⁸⁸

5. In Contrast to Pusey's Conciliar Model, Grafton Believed that Laity Must Also Be Present in Councils in Order to Discern the Mind of God, Such Discernment Being the "Whole Purpose of Councils":

In a letter to the Editor of *The Living Church* of

⁸⁷ Grafton, *Addresses and Sermons*, 403.

⁸⁸ Charles C. Grafton, *The Lineage of the American Catholic Church* (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1914), 222.

December 28, 1901, Grafton offers advice to be seriously considered today:

We are governed, or seek to be governed in Church affairs, by the Mind, and Will of God. To this end the Holy Spirit dwells in the Church and presides in its councils. What a Church council seeks by its debates and votes to ascertain as certain is, not the mind of the majority of its Church members, but the Mind of the Spirit.... It is by the agreement of the Bishops, the clergy, and the laity, acting separately, that this mind is shown. The plan of proportionate representation, in order that the voice of the majority may be learned, is then based upon false principle. It is the endeavor to reconstruct the city of God upon the earthly principles of the city of Babylon.⁸⁹

I end this essay with Bishop Grafton because he clearly sought to articulate the adaptation of the conciliar tradition of The Episcopal Church forcefully to a renewal of mission so that our Church might be sustained for the future. It was not to deal with internal party division or end schism, which had so often been the purpose of conciliarism in the past. It was to lead to growth. Grafton was engaged in a mission of hope in the future, and pride in the form of Episcopal Church government was part of that

⁸⁹ Grafton, *Letters and Addresses*, 199-200.

hope. James O. S. Huntington is sure of this overriding purpose in his 1912 funeral sermon for Grafton:

... Bishop Grafton believed in the Church, in which he ministered as one of its chief pastors, as a part of the mystical body of Christ. He knew her failings and defects, and he grieved over them. But he never despaired of her, never doubted that God was with her ... To the last, as one of another of his clergy after an interview said farewell, he would send them out with the words ringing in their ears, 'Press on the Kingdom;' and the kingdom was for all mankind.⁹⁰

Such a zeal for mission ultimately should be our reason for studying ecclesiology, and then acting on it.

⁹⁰ James O.S. Huntington, *Bishop Grafton: Commemorative Volume* (Fond du Lac: 1913). Huntington's sermon can also be found in B. Talbot Rogers, *The Works of the Rt. Rev. Charles C. Grafton*, Vol. IV (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1914), 310-313. The author of the most recent biography of Grafton, Eldridge H. Pendleton, supports this interpretation of Grafton's ministry by entitling the biography *Press on, the Kingdom*. Bishop George Sumner in his essay in this collection raises important questions about how my prior article on J. Robert Wright in R. William Franklin, "American, Anglican, and Catholic," in M. Dutton and P. Gray, eds. *One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Erdmans, 2006), 120-128, and my treatment of Bishop Grafton in this essay and other essays relate to my defense of "National Conciliarism" in this 2018 essay. My hope is that Bishop Sumner's essay opens a door for further exchanges between the two of us about the proper role of the heritage of conciliarism for The Episcopal Church of the future. Our further work on this topic in dialogue together I believe can itself further the greater unity of our Church and I welcome it.

Towards a More “Ecological” Ecclesiology: Subsidiarity and Conciliarism in Context

GEORGE SUMNER

The late Rowan Greer, professor of Anglican studies and patristics at Yale, liked to find at the heart of many a theological conundrum what he called the “pattern of continuity/discontinuity.” By this he meant that it often proves helpful in sifting through theological difficulties to understand entities, or ideas, in real but partial relationship to one another. Disconnect them, on the one hand, or unite them, on the other, and troubles ensue. Of course, keeping things connected but not absorbed, and maintaining them in balance and in proper order, can be a hard task.

As Avery Dulles reminds us, there are various models of the Church in the New Testament. Nevertheless, let us begin with the one image of the Church most important to the essays in *Remembering and Re-imagining*: the image of the church as “the Body of Christ.” With this image, we can understand best how this pattern of continuity and discontinuity works itself out in ecclesiology. Christ is the head of the body, by which is meant not a mere part, but the directing and sovereign agent over the whole body. Still, the body is connected to the head, and they make up

together a single organism. The head is over the body and yet one with it. Drawing the most obvious conclusion from this image, we can conclude that there are some things we must not say.¹ The Church is not equivalent to Christ, nor does it have the status, without qualification, of being the continuation of Christ on earth. It is sinful, forgetful, wandering, and so on. At the same time we cannot separate the two, as if the ascendant Christ had checked out, only to return at the end, and had in the interim left us by ourselves to keep things going as best we can by our own lights. The commission of the risen Christ² and the coming of the Holy Spirit³ assure us that he remains in the Church, in a privileged way by contrast with the world at large. The presence of Christ remains with us "to the end of the age."⁴ This is true while at the same time he also judges the Church and goes ahead of it. We might compare this, for example, to the way in which we profess that Christ is really present in Holy Communion, but not in a way that is magical, possess-able, and hence manipulable.

My purpose in this essay is to enter into a dialogue with my fellow Episcopalians over issues of mutual concern about our contemporary doctrine of the Church. As such at the outset I want to point out important common ground. Like the other essayists, we too in the diocese of Dallas want carefully to reread our own canonical and liturgical inheritance for guidance in how we, under the guidance of the Word of God, may rightly understand

¹ Christopher Morse, *Not Every Spirit: A Dogmatics of Christian Disbelief* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994).

² See Jn 20.

³ See Acts 2.

⁴ Mt 28:20.

the nature of the Church. Such is our habit of mind as Anglicans, according to the rule of thumb *lex orandi lex credendi*. We affirm the centrality of the same themes our interlocutors have identified. We agree that, with respect to the authoritative bodies and offices within our own particular church, "subsidiarity" best describes the desired relationship; and that outside of our own church and in communion with our fellow churches, "conciliarism" captures best the one Church's goal. In other words, our dialogue has a shared set of concepts defining a shared arena, within which we can fruitfully ask and answer, agree and disagree.

One more prefatory word cannot go unsaid. Sometimes our contemporary discussions of the doctrine of the Church have a certain "post-traumatic" feature to them. Ideas have become connected to earlier struggles over the possibility of leaving the communion of the Church. That is not the issue at present, and I hope that the value and veracity of the ideas presented here will be considered on their own terms. Likewise, in Episcopal discourse on this topic, legal/canonical meanings have sometimes elbowed out theological senses. This itself is an example of the worrisome disjunction of ecclesiology from Christology, as if we could consider the Church as merely a political, social, and legal entity.

There are other contemporary ways in which this potential disjunction might take place. I have a real sympathy for our Presiding Bishop's description of the Church as a "Jesus movement." It keeps the head over the body, and fits the early history of the Church. But, like the word "spirituality," the expression "Jesus movement" easily takes on a certain anti-

institutional tinge, even as our interest in things full-bloodedly institutional, like the prerogative of the General Convention, continues unabated. Movement and institution might come to be disconnected. Is not the task of ecclesiology precisely to keep such spheres of discourse in close contact one with another?⁵

Perhaps the bitterest fruit of our Church's post-traumatic effect appears when matters come to be most strongly contested. Whatever the prior constitutional understanding, whatever the precedent, the answer sometimes comes impatiently back: the General Convention has no court of appeal, and the answer to every question is whatever Convention says it is. Yet appeals to sheer power are the end of discourse, not a form of it.

Any reading of our Constitution takes us directly to the *Book of Common Prayer*, where we find that pride of place is given to the authority of the Word of God. It serves after all as the rule of faith in the great tradition, and this is reflected not only in the Constitution but also in the vows made in our ordinal, as well as in the catechism. But, one might reply, do not the interminable debates about Scripture's meaning negate its usefulness? Can't the less than virtuous also quote it for their purposes? Indeed, this is only a way to say that the Church is made up of fallible yet forgiven sinners. But this recognition is not the end of the matter. We can claim the great Reformation confidence that the Scriptures are perspicuous--that on what matters most they are most clear. To be sure, disagreements have always followed, and will continue to do so. But at the very least we need to understand debates about ecclesiology as struggles in exegesis. To abandon

⁵ One finds a similar issue with the popular expression *missio Dei*, which has in its history, and continues sometimes, to take on a sense in contrast to the institutional life of the Church.

this most theological of claims about the exercise of authority in the Church would be a counsel of despair at the outset.

This connection between exegesis and ecclesiology, and both the mandate and the humility that follow from it, have indeed been embedded in our self-understanding as Anglicans from the first. Article 20 of the Thirty-Nine Articles gives the Church the authority to approve rites and to adjudge controversies of doctrine, but it promptly limits this work-order to what is consistent with the Word of God. In the very next article, no sooner is the power to call a council affirmed, than we are reminded of the risk of "erring" and the consequence that the decision would then be without authority. We are back to continuity/discontinuity: the Church can neither shirk its responsibility nor abrogate to itself a certainty about the rightness of its own decisions.

Here a second approach to our question is helpful. Imagine our ecclesiology as that of an ecological niche. Its substratum is the Word of God (ordered and presented to us through the Prayer Book tradition). We may concede that our church, represented and gathered together in convention (for purposes of our present discussion anyway) is placed as "middle earth." In the foreground are the local dimensions of our life: the parish, the diocese, and its bishop. Here the principle of subsidiarity—that is, of respecting deliberation at the most local possible level—reigns. Our polity, for example, has throughout its history understood the stewardship of the Prayer Book as legitimately under the purview of the church gathered in convention. But this very provision implies that there are a host of matters, not so designated, that

should continue to be considered at more local levels of the ecclesial ecology. Whalon at one point offers the analogy of the European Union (perhaps poignantly at this point), in which member states are not bound to concede authority in any area not agreed upon at their original union.⁶ Likewise, in a 2006 essay, Franklin writes that the eighteenth-century framers of TEC polity envisioned the church as a “federation” or “loose association of dioceses.” A “strength” of this historic polity, he writes, is its “protection of the synodal authority of the local church, the diocese, within a national federation of dioceses.”⁷

⁶ Pierre Whalon, “Subsidiarity: The Key to Understanding The Episcopal Church,” in *Re-membling and Re-imagining: Essays on The Episcopal Church*.

⁷ See R. William Franklin, “American, Anglican and Catholic,” in *One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism*, eds. M. Dutton and P. Gray (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2006), 126-27. This acknowledgement may seem to sit in some tension with Franklin’s more recent assertion of the unrestricted sovereignty of General Convention. In this 2006 essay from a *festschrift* for J. Robert Wright, Franklin goes on to cite with favor the historically resourced ecumenical work of Wright, who sought to place the eighteenth-century proximate origins of TEC polity within its ancient roots in the one Church of the creeds. To see ourselves as no more than a “loose association of dioceses, as eighteenth century polity dictated,” Franklin writes, was insufficient for Wright in his extensive ecumenical labors. Rather, the ecumenical agreements that Wright helped TEC enter into “have made the Episcopal Church increasingly part of a coherent world communion.” “These agreements,” Franklin argues, should now “be more decisively reflected in the constitutional polity of the American church.” “The weakness of the American model,” Franklin writes, “is that it contains no way in which the local church—even a federation of dioceses—can relate to the universal church.” As a Communion Partner bishop, I can only agree with Franklin’s call to build into our polity a more constitutive and consultative relationship with the wider Anglican Communion and Church catholic, as our ecumenical commitments and the preamble of our Constitution seem to require. However, I would suggest that the place of the diocese in the minds of the eighteenth-century framers of TEC polity is not necessarily an obstacle standing in the way of this relationship, but rather a healthy recognition of the principle of subsidiarity by which a local diocese is not simply a creature of the national church but rather also of the

If the Word is "beneath" us, and the diocese and bishop are in the foreground, the wider communion stretches out in the background of our own church's life. Here, too, we must eschew any separation of our ordering of our church from our aspiration to hear and obey our Lord. Head and body cannot be severed. Though it seems to have ground to a halt in recent years, the ecumenical movement is a part of our background. It grows out of the Johannine imperative that we all "may be one."⁸ We must listen closely to our sibling churches. Meanwhile, in our own time, spurred painfully by the divisive debate over sexuality, the churches in our own Anglican family have engaged in one of the most remarkable exercises in conciliarism in the history of the modern Church. Whatever we think of the issue itself, is not that precisely what the struggle over "instruments," Windsor, and the Anglican Covenant has been? To be sure, conciliarism is not coercion. It is not hierarchy in the sense we associate with Rome. In the Covenant itself, churches were always left free to agree or not, to associate or disassociate as their conscience dictated.

Here, too, it is worth noting that in the background with conciliarism, as in the foreground with subsidiarity, we find the characteristic Anglican diffusion of authority, akin to the "separation of powers" that must seem familiar to an American! In fact, "dispersed authority" amounts to a kind of shorthand for what we have called the "ecology" in which we live and to which

wider "world communion" and "universal church." As Franklin writes, this is a "strength" of historic TEC polity, in its "protection of the synodal authority of the local church, the diocese."

⁸ Jn 17:21

we have a responsibility. This theme was repeatedly important for the late Bishop Stephen Sykes in his studies of a distinctly Anglican ecclesiology. For Sykes, the home of all doctrine in liturgy in the local congregation is the basis for a kind of authority grounded in subsidiarity.⁹ Likewise, conciliarism means that we in our hearing of the Word have an obligation dispersedly to those who have preceded us, to those at the furthest reaches of the earth, and to our critics. Sykes cites the 1948 Lambeth Conference in its claim that dispersed authority is “God’s loving provision against the temptation to tyranny and the dangers of unchecked power.”¹⁰

In the case of our own Episcopal tradition, conciliarism, commended to us on these more general Anglican grounds, finds a more explicit warrant in one of our foundational documents. We are commanded by the Prayer Book to remain in communion with the teaching of the Church of England, with which all of the Communion’s churches have a relation. The communion is found here *in nuce*, of which we must be cognizant in the task of conciliarism.

What are the purposes of subsidiarity on the one hand and conciliarism on the other? With respect to the first, the goal is to find an appropriate contextuality, a freedom consistent with *koinonia* in faith and practice. The local Eucharistic community is, as Lesslie Newbigin liked to say, the best hermeneutic of the Gospel.¹¹ As for conciliarism, we might call the goal

⁹ Stephen Sykes, *The Integrity of Anglicanism* (London: Mowbray, 1978), ch. 7.

¹⁰ Stephen Sykes, *Unashamed Anglicanism* (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1999), 157.

¹¹ Leslie Newbigin, *The Gospel in a Pluralistic Society* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989).

"recognizability." Other churches help us to perceive whether or not a change is a valid and lasting development. In other words, we need the wider ecology of the Church to test whether the life of the Body is consistent with its head.

If we pause for a moment on the latter term, we may note that there is a considerable corpus of scholarship about conciliarism. It is worthwhile to highlight one valuable summary of the topic. Paul Avis, the noted Anglican ecclesiohistorian, offers a concise list of the major elements of conciliarism.¹² It begins with a sense of the whole "catholic" Church, to whom the Gospel is entrusted and with reference to which the particular church must have a mind. There is a valid role for nations and their churches. Subsidiarity is its counterweight. Theologians have their place in its deliberations. Finally, it must pay attention to the representation of the laity and the observance of the parameters of constitutionality. By these means the larger reality of the Church is kept before the eyes of the local particular church, and there is a check against the excessive accumulation of power. It is easy to see how each element is found in our polity and how the theme reinforces the idea of exercising governance with the whole ecology of the Church, as support and constraint, in mind.

Arguably, the key article in the *Re-membering and Re-imagining* collection is by Bishop William Franklin on conciliarism.¹³ As a historian, he seeks to place our understanding of the General

¹² Paul Avis, *Beyond the Reformation?* (London: T&T Clark, 2006).

¹³ William Franklin, "Conciliarism and the Ecclesiology of The Episcopal Church" in *Re-membering and Re-imagining: Essays on the Ecclesiology of The Episcopal Church*.

Convention in relation to the conciliar movement from the 13th to the 15th centuries, its antecedents in the ancient church, and the continuation of the movement in later Roman Catholicism. He then turns to its effects on the English Reformation, Episcopal history per se, and finally to his prime example of Bishop Charles Grafton of Fond du Lac.

As we just saw in Avis' work, there are several elements to the conciliar idea that exist in counterweight. One is the precedent for the national church in a specific place to meet in council, along with a sense (eventually) that both ordained and lay people have a rightful place in its deliberations. But the other is the imperative for churches to take council together, across such boundaries, with the Council of Jerusalem and the later ecumenical councils as the archetypes. We might correlate the first element with what we have called "the foreground" and the latter with "the background." The struggle over the claims of one against the other dominated much of later medieval history, but this only confirms the importance of both.

Franklin's article begins with both in evidence, but as it progresses, all the attention is paid to the fittingness of the national church having its own council. This affirmation of the national element is fair enough, but it is not in itself sufficient. The conciliar movement in its heyday gathered bishops from across the Catholic world, and in our own time we witnessed Vatican II. The English Reformers retained hope (futile it turned out) for a general council. Bishop Grafton himself was drawn to the Old Catholics and the Eastern Church precisely in pursuit of a fuller and more conciliar catholicity. Finally, Franklin notes how an historical ecclesiologist like Gillian Evans poses the contemporary and thoroughly conciliar question, "What happens when a

province acts so independently as to become an absent and separate church?" This too is a conciliar concern. By the end of the essay, Franklin's case for the national claim has obscured conciliarism's general, "catholic" interest. While I share Franklin's concern to affirm the principle of conciliarism, it must be set within the wider "ecology" of the Church if it is to have its proper sense, rather than becoming a way of arguing that each particular church may have its own "council" apart from the wider conciliar vectors of the one Church.¹⁴

¹⁴ See William Franklin, "Conciliarism and the Ecclesiology of The Episcopal Church." Franklin cites a 2008 paper of Robert Royce, which argues that General Convention is the "highest council" of The Episcopal Church, with "every power inherent in such a body." Likewise, he cites James Dator's unpublished 1959 dissertation on Episcopal Church polity, which he says "goes so far as to defend and document the idea that the ancient canons of the Undivided Church and the catholic faith itself are interpreted and adapted solely by the General Convention within the polity of The Episcopal Church." Franklin judges that Royce's choice of the word "council" to identify the General Convention opens "a crucial door" to "understanding the authority of this Church," and proposes that we may find in the medieval conciliar movement the ecclesiological precedent we need to understand the "unrestricted" "sovereign authority" of the General Convention in The Episcopal Church's polity. The General Convention can thus be understood as a "council," and we have sound precedent in using "the ecclesiology of conciliarism to defend the authority of national church bodies." Yet I fear that Franklin here has not rightly grasped the heart of the conciliar movement, whose concern was not directed inward to defend the autonomy of national particular churches as possessing "councils" in their own right, but rather outward in its aspiration for a general council of the Church as a counterweight to the growing authority of the papacy. Paul Valliere, in his magisterial 2012 treatise on conciliarism, draws on the historic conciliarist tradition to argue in precisely the opposite direction of Franklin, calling for a pan-Anglican council to resolve our protracted disputes. While Franklin engages with Valliere at length in his essay, it is perhaps less than clear in his remarks that the lessons Valliere draws from the conciliar tradition for contemporary

The Episcopal Church, including its General Convention, exists then in a wider ecology, with parishes and dioceses in its foreground and the wider church in its background. Only in their inter-relation can the Church be understood. Debates about the hierarchical power of the General Convention per se, without the whole ecology in view, are bound to be unhelpful. Power over what? And to what end? In consultation with whom? An ecological ecclesiology gives such questions their due.

Let us offer a third and final vector for an Episcopal ecclesiology. What we as Anglicans are feeling our way toward is a doctrine of the Church that is truly catholic and also diffuse. A part of such an Anglican doctrine of the Church is its understanding of the nature and role of doctrine itself. Reticence on the subject does not constitute an absence thereof, as Sykes was

Anglicanism are so at odds with the lessons drawn by Franklin. See Paul Valliere, *Conciliarism: A History of Decision-Making in the Church* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 197-244. Franklin also cites his 2011 exchange in *The Living Church* with Ephraim Radner on this issue. Radner and Valliere come to similar conclusions over against a position like Franklin's, which this passage from Radner's response to Franklin illustrates:

"Despite his final concern regarding the 'international' character of conciliarism, Bishop Franklin does not grant this aspect its proper emphasis. Rather, he wants us to see conciliarism as a developing spur to the integrity of ecclesial regionalism... But whatever the unintended outcomes might have been, conciliarism was definitely *not* ordered to a regional or national understanding of the Church; even among its most 'secularly' ordered proponents, like Marsilius of Padua, it was rather an ecclesial theology meant to serve the *Church universal*. The life of the 'nations,' Pierre d'Ailly said, was subversive of the Council, which is about oneness. As an ecclesiology, conciliarism was founded on the meaning and purpose of a 'General Council,' whereat representatives of *all* local churches might gather in order faithfully to shape the life of the whole Church Catholic..." See Ephraim Radner, "The Local Church Serves the Whole," *The Living Church* 243, no. 8 (Oct. 9, 2011): 22-25.

fond of reminding us.¹⁵ Here we may go a step further. In the domain of comparative religion, the philosopher William Christian spoke of "doctrines about alien claims,"¹⁶ that is, doctrines about how to make sense of the doctrines other communities held. Similarly, we might speak here about an implicit "doctrine about contested doctrine" between churches. That is after all what the Windsor/Covenant process was seeking, whatever one may think of its results. What kind of doctrine about contested doctrine would be consistent with our Anglican ecclesiology, including the elements of subsidiarity and conciliarism balanced together in "ecological" harmony? How would such a doctrine help us understand the relationship between "foreground," "middle earth," and "background"—that is to say, between parish, diocese, bishop, the General Convention, and the wider Anglican Communion and ecumenical horizon?

To conclude, I offer some thoughts toward an answer to this question, rather than a precise and settled view of what such a doctrine would need to hold. First of all, it seems to me a satisfactory Anglican doctrine about contested doctrine would need to show a certain humility. We are, in Michael Ramsey's expression, a "broken" church, all the more so now, whose vocation at best points to but does not comprise wholeness.¹⁷ This in turn leads to the virtue of patience. A contested doctrine must

¹⁵ Sykes, *The Integrity of Anglicanism*.

¹⁶ William Christian, *The Doctrines of Religious Communities: A Philosophical Study* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987), ch. 7-8.

¹⁷ Michael Ramsey, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* (London: Longmans, Green, 1936).

be received by others, and this implies the recognition of which I have already spoken. From both of these come implications for the local church and for the communion. As to the former, those who hold to the traditional view within the national church require space for their witness and protection. They remind the particular national church of the view not yet abandoned, and this abiding witness is part of the testing. As to the wider communion, categories of variable or nuanced communion are inevitable. Whether terms like “impaired” or “tiered” are the best alternatives is beside the point. Something that signals the ongoing contestation, but does not prematurely rupture communion, is required. Throughout all of this, in patience and with a role for fellow churches, painful though the process may be, an implicit doctrine about contested doctrine is needed, one consistent with our implied ecclesiology itself.

It is in the service of a renewed and truly catholic ecclesiology that I offer these questions and friendly criticisms, in dialogue with my fellow bishops.¹⁸ May this essay be a modest contribution to vigorous dialogue within our church, and as such, an offering of praise and thanksgiving to almighty God, who in Christ promises to abide with us to the end of the ages.

¹⁸ I would like to thank the Rev. Canon Jordan Hylden, canon theologian for the diocese of Dallas, for assistance in researching and writing this essay. I would also like to thank the Ecclesiology Committee for accepting this further submission to their Report, and for graciously issuing an open invitation to members of our church to do so. We in the diocese of Dallas welcome further theological dialogue about these perplexing issues, both in print and in person.

What is a Bishop, Anyway?

PIERRE W. WHALON

At a recent meeting of bishops, the question came up: what is a bishop? Those attending had no problem answering for themselves, of course, but it was agreed that this is a recurring question. Since we are bishops of the Episcopal Church (i.e., “governed by bishops”), one would hope that there would be some basic agreement on the answer.

Well, no. For one thing, our church attracts many newcomers, who either have ideas about bishops from their previous experience, or no experience at all other than, in some cases, prejudices against bishops. Another reality is that no one who becomes a bishop can grasp at first what has happened. Becoming a bishop is not like winning a prize or a promotion, although people often see it that way.

Furthermore, in my church, there have been some scandals concerning bishops, including one who refused to resign his post despite the damage he had done to his diocese, yet another accused of inappropriate relationships while still a parish priest, and so on. Besides abuse and alleged abuse of authority, there are those bishops who have refused to exercise their authority, or were afraid to, though these never make the scandal sheets.

So, what is a bishop, anyway? What follows is a personal reflection as I enter my eighteenth year of consecration as Bishop in charge of the Convocation of Episcopal Churches in Europe and Suffragan to the Presiding Bishop. Answering this question has become routine for me, as our congregations are filled with people from around the world. Only about one-quarter or fewer members are actually Episcopalians or from other member churches of the Anglican Communion.¹ Furthermore, many people no longer have even a basic grasp of Christianity, and so “bishop” has become an esoteric term.

I usually explain it as a cleric charged with supervising the churches of a certain region, for the word means “overseer”. This definition is common to all the churches that irrevocably ordain deacons, priests, and bishops. (Among the Latter-day Saints, however, a bishop is an unpaid pastor of a congregation, called a “ward”.) However, even within a single communion (Lutherans, for instance), there can be significantly different understandings of the office as well.² These differences arise from ideas that have developed over time on what constitutes a church. Considering the several dozen images of the church in the New Testament, this should not be surprising.

The nature of ordination: the institution

To ask what is a bishop is, first, to inquire into the nature of

¹ See www.tec-europe.org. The origin of this essay was a request from a bishop-elect to “help me become a good bishop.” I hope it was of some little help...

² See e.g., Joseph A. Burgess, “An Evangelical Episcopate?” in *Called and Ordained: Lutheran Perspectives on the Office of the Ministry*, ed. Todd W. Nichol & Marc Kolden (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2004), pp.137-150.

ordination itself. The Risen Christ sent people with the Message (the word “apostle” means “sent”) of the Good News of the Reign of God, whose coming he announced and then embodied in dying and rising again. The first was Mary Magdalene, according to John’s Gospel (John 20:17-18).³ The disciples who had become apostles in turn named others, symbolized their appointment by the rite of laying on of hands. One who burst into their proto-Church, Saul of Tarsus, claimed to have been added directly to the apostles by the risen Christ. Paul’s teaching on mission, ministry and church leadership profoundly redirected the missionary energy of the first followers of the Way. Ordination as The Episcopal Church practices it now is rooted in the apostolic mission, as a service to the Church at large, to equip the saints for their individual and communal part of God’s mission.⁴

The first bishops were those appointed by the apostles from among the first communities,⁵ though at first the term “presbyter / elder” (both possible translations of Greek *presbyteros*) appears to have been used interchangeably with “bishop / overseer” (*episkopos*) These people were probably agreed upon both by the itinerant messengers and the local faithful. Small clusters of believers at first, they had no need for more institutionalization. But ordination is Spirit-led institutionalization. It has from the beginning allowed the Church to continue despite the turnover of generations and persecutions, heresies and schisms. (A concise summary of the development of the Order of Bishops, from its roots in the New Testament to modern times, can be found in the

³ Jn 20:17-18.

⁴ Eph 4:11-13.

⁵ See Phil 1:1.

second chapter of the so-called “Rochester Report.”⁶)

The minimal need for administration that the first communities had, however, soon grew larger, as their numbers grew. Ordination is concerned with handing on the faith until Our Lord’s return. It creates a corps of people whose task is to see to it that the Good News continues to be proclaimed to humanity, and validated in the lives of individual believers and the communities that form and nurture them. Charles Williams once observed that the Church must re-invent itself every thirty years.⁷ Ordination is the way we maintain that re-invention, both as new believers are born (again) and their elders move into Larger Life.

We claim that the threefold ministry of deacons, priests, and bishops, as it developed swiftly after the deaths of the first generation of witnesses, is the work of the Spirit. While Jesus Christ is the same head of the Church, yesterday, today, and forever,⁸ the Church on earth continues its movement through time toward Christ. A physicist might remark that going toward something is the exact equivalent of it coming toward you: the equation works either way. Thus, while we proclaim that “Christ will come again,” it is also true that we are going to Christ. In fact, what should continually inspire us is the perspective of that motion: our future belongs to God.

In order to sustain that dynamism the ordained ministry exists in multiple dimensions. The Jesus Movement must be maintained first in its origin, the proclamation of the Good News

⁶ <http://catholicnews.org.uk/content/download/31732/227874/file/cofe-rochester-report-women-bishops-2004.pdf>

⁷ Charles Williams, *The Descent of the Dove* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishers, 2001), 83.

⁸ Heb 13:8

of God in Christ in word and act. The essence of the communal life of the Church—its worship—needs to continue. It has to carry on across geographical and cultural separation of communities, and through the passage of time. “The faith once delivered to the saints”⁹ constantly needs to be faithfully handed on to new generations of saints, in every language, within every culture. This requires an institution.

Part of the disdain that “the institution” evokes in many is caused by the fact that the Church, as an organized body, develops in ways that often appear to contradict the Church’s mission. The constant threat and reality of schism form habits of thinking and acting that conflict with the gospel message of forgiveness and love. Church splits sometimes occur over serious doctrinal differences, but they are just as often the result of what are essentially power struggles. The contests between Rome and Constantinople in the eleventh century and between the Rome and the England’s Tudor monarchs in the sixteenth are arguably both cases in point.

Again and again I have had to confront this disdain, because bishops *are* the institution. It is sometimes expressed as the need for a congregation to do what it wants, quite apart from my input. Building up the Convocation of Episcopal Churches in Europe as a self-governing jurisdiction, virtually an independent Episcopal diocese ministering in several countries on the Continent,¹⁰ meant learning how to help people see the need for each other, and providing vehicles for that need to be expressed and to be met. A diocese exists to serve the needs of its congregations that they

⁹ Jude 3.

¹⁰ See tec-europe.org.

cannot meet for themselves, and the spiritual power of unity—the first “note” of the Church—is always needed, among us all.

Bishop-priest-deacon: deacon first

As we have seen, the threefold ministry of deacon, priest, and bishop is the inheritance of the first churches. Other conceptions of the ordained ministry came later, and since the publication of the World Council of Churches Report, *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry*,¹¹ there is an emerging ecumenical consensus on the ancient pattern. Each requires the ordinand to make a submission to the authority of the Church: “to conform to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Episcopal Church,” in the words of the Ordinal. Moreover, deacons and priests vow to obey the bishop in authority over them, since the latter is responsible for the overall health of the diocese. (In the Church of England and some other Anglican Churches, suffragan bishops swear to obey the diocesan, and the diocesans pledge their obedience to the Archbishop of their province, i.e., York or Canterbury.)

However, Christ taught that the one in authority must be servant of all.¹² For this reason, the deacon is the first order, in the image of the One who came “not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life...”¹³ Like the other orders, the deacon exemplifies an aspect of the life and work of the Church, the people of God. All the baptized are called to serve others as Christ serves us, meeting essential needs for spiritual and material wellbeing. Deacons

¹¹ <https://www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents/commissions/faith-and-order/i-unity-the-church-and-its-mission/baptism-eucharist-and-ministry-faith-and-order-paper-no-111-the-lima-text>

¹² See Mk 10:42-44 and parallels.

¹³ Mk 10:45.

embody this fundamental role, and through their ministry, enable and assist God's people to be servants of God's mission. "Where my servant [literally, 'deacon'] is, there I am."¹⁴

It has often been argued that the Priesthood is the only "real" order, especially in the Roman Catholic and Lutheran Churches. In this light, a deacon is a deficient priest, without the power and authority to bless, to absolve sins, and to consecrate the bread and wine. A bishop is simply a priest with the added charism of being able to ordain.¹⁵ While some Anglicans have also argued this, the concept ignores both the historical development of the threefold ministry and its theological significance.

The priest embodies and enables the royal priesthood of the people of God to serve as the mediators between God's fierce desire for us and the wayward desire for God embedded deep in the human spirit. Priests lift "up" to God the woes, hopes, and adoration of humanity, and bring "down" the forgiveness and blessing of God, through the ministry of Word and sacraments.

And Christ has given priests the authority and the mandate to proclaim the arrival of God's Kingdom,¹⁶ and to demand the changes that the transforming power of the Holy Spirit requires of us all.¹⁷

This commission is what the bishop embodies and enables the people of God to be and do: to proclaim the Word of God with

¹⁴ Jn 12:26.

¹⁵ See Bernard Hoose, *Authority in the Catholic Church: Theory and Practice* (London: Routledge, 2017).

¹⁶ Mt 28:19.

¹⁷ 2Cor 5:18-20.

boldness¹⁸ and power, having a mandate from the living God to be and act as citizens of the Kingdom. God's will *is* being done on earth as it is in heaven, and standing on this fact, the bishop works in the shadow of the Cross. The first apostles did not create the Church, but they went into all the world as witnesses of Christ.¹⁹ It is that witness, directed and enabled by the Spirit, that has led to the billions of faithful on Earth today.

This is the real meaning of the "apostolic succession." The bishop represents to the people their continuity in time as well as faith with the very first followers of Jesus. When confirmands reiterate and accept for themselves the promises made on their behalf at baptism, for instance, they do so in front of the bishop, which is metaphorically to the whole communion of saints, past and present. As with the first bishops appointed by the apostles, the bishop lays hands on each confirmand, asking for the Spirit's power to send him or her into the world as part of God's mission.

Something similar happens at ordination. The successors of the apostles ordain for and with the people of God new ministers of God's mission. One essential difference between confirmation and ordination is that the layperson is empowered, set free for his or her unique mission and ministry, whereas the ordinand renounces that freedom.²⁰ This act of obedience helps to enable the people to follow and obey Jesus Christ as not only Savior who loves them unconditionally, but also Lord, whose teachings they promise to follow and obey.

¹⁸ Acts 28:31.

¹⁹ Acts 1:8.

²⁰ Every candidate for Deacon and Priest, at their ordination, vows to obey their bishop. See the ordinals for Deacon and Priest, BCP pp. 538 and 543, and 526 and 532, respectively.

The bishop is also priest and deacon, thus summing up what Holy Orders are for. As the representatives of Christ and of God's people, bishops must accept responsibility not only for the faithful of the diocese, clergy and lay, but also for all the people residing in the diocese. And the bishop is always working with other bishops, ordaining new bishops and "sharing in the leadership of the Church throughout the world."²¹ This requires living out, among the other promises, the final vow of the Baptismal Covenant: "to strive for justice and peace among all people, and respect the dignity of every human being." Thus, bishops are not denominational officials only, but responsible to God—within their very real human limitations and failings—for all people within and without their dioceses. This is what the word "bishop" (*episkopos*—overseer) really means: someone who looks out—oversees—for the wellbeing of others.

In a way, becoming a bishop is re-discovering one's ordination as deacon. This is why I insist at ordinations of deacons that this is the most important order. The bishop is servant of all, and while that begins at baptism for all of us, for bishops it is the heart of their ministry.

In particular, whether the diocese is small or large, there is one essential function that cannot be delegated, a special ministry of service. It is to be the shepherd of the vision of the diocese's ministry, as the basic unit of the Church. I inherited and accepted the vision of my predecessor, Bishop Jeffrey Rowthorn, for the churches in Europe. Since 2001, I have worked to make his dream reality, alongside some of the best clergy and lay leaders in the Episcopal Church. We all know that the people perish if there is

²¹ BCP, 517.

no vision (Proverbs 29:18). The person responsible for casting that vision, communicating it, and leading in its realization, evaluation, and re-casting, is the bishop. This is the essence of episcopal leadership.

Ministry to evil

When I was elected to become Bishop-in-charge, an old friend and former church history professor told me that he had seen many former students become bishops. What he observed was that, as priests, their ministry had been essentially to people's pain, but as bishops they were now ministering to people's evil.

This grim bit of wisdom refers to the disciplinary role of episcopal ministry. By swearing to conform to the "doctrine, discipline and worship" of the church, the ordained are "under orders": they must respect the church's canons and the rubrics of the liturgy. It falls to the bishop to see to it that they do, which is essentially why deacons and priests are required to swear obedience to their bishop. Bishops in turn are disciplined by the House of Bishops, through the ministry of the Presiding Bishop. Failing to apply the canons is itself an actionable offense for a bishop.

In a larger perspective, bishops vow at their consecration to "guard the faith of the Church and defend its unity." Thus, the bishop defends from evil the life of the churches under his or her authority, and shares that role more widely with the college of bishops around the world. It is also the bishop's task to see to it that the Word is preached, the sacraments faithfully administered, and the faith taught in all the churches of the diocese. So the first role is to be an example of faithful preaching, effective liturgical presidency, and sound teaching. Since the bishop is the head of

every church in the diocese, this is normally exercised when the bishop visits a congregation. The way I conceive of this is that my jurisdiction must be a circle large enough for creative preaching and worship, and clear, effective teaching. But make no mistake: the circle is circumscribed by the Scriptures that contain all things necessary to salvation (a circle within which these are found), by the sacramental rites of the Book of Common Prayer, and by the Catechism. Keeping everything in the circle is the bishop's task. It is also necessary to realize that the circle moves in time. Personally, I conceive of this as "adding and perfecting the old with the new."²²

Binding and loosing: a type of administration

Although people often think the bishop is basically an administrator, in fact this function must be wholly or partially delegated. The diocesan structure exists as the extension of the bishop's ministry, and while he or she cannot elude responsibility for its good functioning, that is secondary to the actual life and work of bishops. In the Episcopal Church, the ministry of the diocese's standing committee is in fact to support the bishop, and also to serve as a check on his or her authority.

In the long run, the bishop bears a responsibility that cannot be avoided. I tell people sometimes that they can leave their church, the clergy can leave as well, but the bishop remains responsible. This authority, however, is not that of a hierarchy, a religious dictator, but rather stems from the call of God upon the bishop. "Obey your leaders and submit to them, for they are

²² Mt 13:52. See also apologies to Leo XIII, *Æternis Patris*, para. 24; *vetera novis augere et perficere...*

keeping watch over your souls and will have to give an account [to God, as well as the people]. Let them do this with joy and not with sighing—for that would be harmful to you.”²³

This obedience should not be onerous. Rather, like following Jesus, “it is a good and joyful thing,” done out of the perfect freedom that serving God brings. The account that the bishop will have to give is a weight to carry about, and it is often very isolating as well. But it is the wellspring from which this ministry flows. This is why bishops in particular exercise the authority given to the first apostles, that “whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven, and whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven.” This permission is given to Peter personally in Matthew 16:19, along with the “keys to the kingdom,” and collectively to the apostles in Matthew 18:18. A parallel, though not an exact one, is found in John 20:23: “Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained.”

There has been a lot of controversy over the meaning and exercise of this “power.” The first instance of its exercise is found in Acts 15, the description of the Council of Jerusalem that allowed Gentiles to become Christians, without being circumcised as if they had to become Jews first. (That, however, was a decision not only of the apostles present, but also “the whole church,” and it is the embryo of the tradition of councils to decide matters for the whole Church.²⁴) As delegates of the bishop, priests also absolve sins, and can also excommunicate, though in our church,

²³ Heb 13:17.

²⁴ See Charles Robertson’s essay in this collection, “Proto-conciliarism in Acts 15”.)

the bishop must support that decision for it to become effective.

The bishop alone decides whether to give permission for a remarriage after divorce in the Episcopal Church. This is considered part of “loosing and binding.” Furthermore, the ministry of exorcism, another type of loosing, is also overseen by the bishop. All the acts of the ordained, beginning with those of bishops, are in the name of not only Christ but also the people of God, embodying the work of the Church and enabling them to be the Church. In the Orthodox and Anglican traditions, therefore, only bishops who actively minister in a diocese may function in this official capacity.

Since the First Council of Nicaea, the general tradition had been that there should be only one diocesan bishop for a diocese. Schisms happen when more than one claims authority over a given area, usually over doctrinal divisions. And conversely, the exercise of episcopal ministry is geographically normally limited to a diocese, so that bishops do not wander all over the world ordaining people. There are exceptions, of course, including my own episcopacy, which is to exercise a jurisdiction of persons, not a geographic diocese.

Those churches that do not ordain bishops argue mostly along historical lines why they believe this ministry died out. Ecumenical dialogue has given rise to the concept of the exercise of the ministry of oversight, however, often referred to by the Greek word *episkope*. Presbyterians, for instance, have claimed that they exercise a collective *episkope*, and do not need bishops. Despite deep differences that remain, these conversations have nevertheless vastly enriched the consideration of what bishops are and do for all Christians.

Only human...

In his sermon at my consecration as bishop, then-Presiding Bishop Frank Griswold pointed out that there is a hidden gift of the episcopacy: the more honorifics and vestments they pile upon you, the more you become aware of your absolute spiritual poverty before God.

Over the years, I have tried to keep those words in mind. Having time daily to pray and study is essential. Of course, I had learned this as a priest, but as a bishop it is even more tempting to think that you don't need these. Sometimes I refer to myself in public as "the sinner-in-chief" to remind first myself, and then those who must listen to me, that the bishop is a sinner like everyone else, but has been given powers that can make the effects of his or her sins reflect back not only on the bishop, but the diocese, the Episcopal Church, the Anglican Communion, and even the Christian Church. I once had a conversation with a Lebanese Christian woman, who informed me that, being a bishop, I had no chance to become a saint. "Why?" I asked, nonplussed. "Because you have to deal with the world," she replied.

Learning how to be "a servant to all" is a constant balancing act between keeping the dignity of your office and your life intact, and throwing off your personal dignity and spending yourself. Your door must be open to all, including the enemies of your friends, and keeping in honest relations with all is very difficult. Everyone wants you on their side, and your desire to be liked is massively tempting, especially your desire to be liked by people who disdain your office.

Furthermore, there will always be people who have claim upon you. Besides the clergy and people, others may appeal to

you as a bishop to help. One very important event in my life was being invited as the Anglican bishop in France to visit Baghdad just before the 2003 war. The Iraqi bishops wanted their people to see that the Westerners had not forgotten them. They rightly feared that it would be the Christians of Iraq who would pay the highest price for the American invasion—as indeed as happened. Four years after my visit, I was contacted *as bishop* by people I had met who needed to find refuge, as they had been personally threatened with death for reason of their faith and had already lost family members to assassination and church bombings. This led me to launch an effort with other people to bring Iraqis to France for political asylum—not just Christians, but anyone threatened with death for reasons of faith. To date, about four thousand people have found security.²⁵ None of them, it happens, are Anglican. Some are Muslims, and a very few are Yazidi.

And one is confronted all too often with what Julian of Norwich called “the wound of compassion.” This is the pain of feeling compassion for another’s suffering, but realizing you cannot do anything to alleviate it. The temptation here is to learn how not to feel for others. This goes along with the general erosion of one’s faith that can result from being exposed to the seamier side of church life over years. For this reason, every bishop today should have a therapist to have some objectivity about one’s motives, and a spiritual director to have clarity about one’s spiritual life. In particular, this ministry requires a keen awareness, renewed daily, of one’s own evil, things done and left undone, if the bishop is to minister effectively to people’s evil.

²⁵ See <http://aemo-france.fr>

At my “baby bishop school” (offered at the beginning of one’s episcopate), Bishop Clay Matthews, then of the Office for Pastoral Development, said something that froze my blood and still does. He said that the support offered to us by the House of Bishops was so that we would not end up like some people who, after retirement, were never heard from again. “They said all the right words, did all the right things, but were completely hollow by the time they resigned.” A very long book could be written on the temptations of a bishop, but one final one is believing that you will make things better. That might happen. You do well if you keep things going in the right direction. And you need to be aware of your limitations. The prayer I have developed for times of frustration is simply, “This church-thing was YOUR idea. YOU fix it. Amen.”

So, what’s a bishop? A redeemed sinner who is asked by God and the Church to take particular responsibility for what the Church is and does, and Whom the Church represents. I am convinced that, so long as bishops remember that the greatest must be servant of all, and act upon that, the exercise of episcopal ministry will continue to build up the Church as we are all drawn by, and move ever closer to, Jesus Christ.

May all the baptized find grace and power to believe in Christ, and act in his stead, that all the world may come into the saving embrace of God’s Holy Spirit.

Sermons and Reflections

Future LGBT priests: Advocates for Christian orthodoxy

IAN MARKHAM and PAUL MOBERLY MAZARIEGOS

We do not claim to be professional sociologists. We concede right at the outset that the sample size is small, although please note the number of seminarians at our Episcopal seminaries is also small. We do recognize that ideally there should have been a wider “control” group of other seminarians for the purposes of comparison. What follows is an invitation into a reality that many seminary professors are sharing in antidote after antidote. It is intended to be a little mischievous—our stereotypes need to be challenged—and offered in a spirit of serious fun. With these riders out of the way, let the journey begin.

The journey of full inclusion of LGBT persons in the Episcopal Church has been a story of slow and steady progress. Integrity USA was founded in 1974 as a grassroots movement of gay people in congregations across the Episcopal Church. In 1976, the Episcopal Church passed a resolution making it clear that “homosexual persons are children of God who have a full and equal claim with all other persons upon the love, acceptance, and

pastoral concern and care of the Church.”¹ By the early 21st century, the Episcopal Church became the center of a global controversy with the election of Bishop Gene Robinson in New Hampshire as the first openly gay bishop. In 2009, the Episcopal Church made it clear that all the orders of ministry are open to all people, thereby inviting gay and lesbians to consider a vocation to Holy Orders in the Church. And in 2015, the Episcopal Church changed the canons of the church to make it explicit that the rite of marriage is available to all people—both heterosexual couples and homosexual couples.

One of the ironies of the slow narrative of the full inclusion of LGBT people in the Church is that both left and right in the Church see it as a triumph for progressive theology. On the one hand, liberals (among them, perhaps most famously, is the former Bishop of Newark, the Rt. Rev. John Shelby Spong) presented inclusion of LGBT persons in the Church as the climax in a battle against oppressive orthodox theology. For theologians such as Spong, theology needs to be freed from the oppressive propensities of orthodoxy. Spong reproduces a piece by Lee Jefferson on his website “A New Christianity for a New World.” It is a classic piece of progressive theology, which in the end calls into question the authority of the Holy Scriptures because of the very nature of the Bible itself. Jefferson writes, “If anything, this exercise questions whether we should develop stances based upon what the Bible ‘says.’ Simply put, the Bible is a complicated collection of documents that was never meant to ‘speak’ to our contemporary situation, but groups often speak through the lens of the Bible and lob textual grenades on issues like same-sex

¹ See The General Convention of the Episcopal Church, 1976. Resolution A069.

marriage.”² The argument here is simple: given the Bible is a “collection of documents” it cannot speak in a coherent way about any issue. For Jefferson and Spong, the LGBT issues reflects a trajectory where the Church moves from ‘orthodoxy’ to a progressive liberalism where authority is not grounded in any God-given text (or of course a person, such as the Eternal Word-made-flesh), but in human discernment through an analysis of our experience.

On the other hand, conservatives such as Philip Turner (writing in *First Things*) argues that when the House of Bishops gave its consent to the election of Bishop Gene Robinson to become the Bishop of New Hampshire, it was a triumph for a liberal theology that had been gathering strength since 1966. It was in 1966 that the Episcopal Church chose to avoid a ‘heresy trial’ over Bishop James Pike’s view of the Trinity. In that moment, argues Turner, doctrinal discipline was no longer required of a bishop. Even over the ordination of women (which Turner supports), misbehaving bishops forced the agenda. Turner sees a Church that is committed to the “espousal of enlightened culture and progressive cultural trends, the use of the episcopal office to further ‘prophetic causes,’ and the inability of governing structures and authorities of ECUSA to restrain independent action on the part of its bishops.”³ In short, Turner argues, “it seems obvious that ECUSA has by its actions confirmed a decision taken unconsciously some time ago to define its primary identity

² See Lee Jefferson, “What does the Bible actually say about gay marriage?” 30, June 2011, as found at <https://johnshelbyspong.com/news/what-does-the-bible-actually-say-about-gay-marriage/> (accessed March 14, 2017).

³ Philip Turner, “The Episcopalian Preference,” in *First Things*, November 2003.

as a liberal (but liturgical) option within the spectrum of American Protestantism.”⁴ On this conclusion, Turner seems to agree completely with Spong. The full inclusion of LGBT people is a triumph for a liberal theology.

Yet this shared analysis by left and right ignores a crucial piece of data. What exactly do LGBT persons believe? With the recent advances in legal protections for LGBT people (including marriage equality), more visibility in popular culture, and a recognition of pastoral needs such as marriage at the level of General Convention, more and more LGBT people have sought Holy Orders. Increasing numbers of dioceses are sending LGBT postulants to seminary, more bishops are willing to ordain them, and more parishes are in a position to consider them in call processes. Just as the institution of the ordination of women led to a wave of women seeking ordination and going to seminary, increasing acceptance and inclusion of LGBT people has led to more LGBT persons entering seminary formation programs. As they arrive on seminary campuses, what sort of theological approaches and expectations are LGBT seminarians bringing with them? Perhaps unexpectedly, it seems that LGBT seminarians are frequently quite theologically orthodox—perhaps more so, even, at times, than their heterosexual peers. Contrary to the expectation of both Turner and Spong, there is strong evidence that the full inclusion of LGBT priests and deacons will not necessarily skew the Church to the left, but rather to the right. A voting block is arriving that wants to affirm the authority of Scripture, and uphold the historic Incarnational and Trinitarian faith of the Church.

⁴ Ibid.

Recently, we undertook a survey of current seminarians in the Episcopal Church who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender (LGBT). Organized by Paul Moberly (a married gay man, then a senior M.Div. student at Virginia Theological Seminary), we undertook to survey the majority of LGBT seminarians enrolled at Episcopal seminaries during the month of November 2016. The Episcopal seminaries are currently training approximately three hundred forty seminarians.⁵ As with women vocations in the 1970s, there was a “bubble” which was waiting for the ordination of women to be approved, there is some evidence that there is a comparable bubble of LGBT vocations. Though actual numbers are impossible to gather, we assumed that 20 percent of the vocations might be LGBT (a total of sixty-four persons). We reached out to these sixty-four people, through the LGBT societies at the different seminaries. We were pleased with a 45 percent response rate (some twenty-nine people participated in the survey).

The results of the survey

Our first discovery was that LGBT seminarians tend to come from a fairly conservative background. Almost half (48.28 percent) grew up in either an evangelical or Roman Catholic/Orthodox tradition. They had been formed in an environment where Biblical authority had been taken seriously. Often their upbringing was

⁵ The precise number of seminarians is difficult to determine. We tried to establish the number of postulants currently at the Episcopal seminaries in November 2016. Our estimates arrived at the following numbers: VTS – 95; Sewanee – 65; SSW – 50; GTS – 20; Nashota – 30; Trinity – 10; CDSP – 45; Bexley Seabury – 15; EDS – 10.

religiously demanding and intense; “coming out” processes for young people in conservative religious families is often a difficult experience, because one becomes vulnerable to rejection not only by one’s family, but also one’s faith community.

Second, we learned that the shape of their theology is creedal. There is, it seems, little sympathy for the Spong vision of a faith beyond theism;⁶ indeed 100 percent of our seminarians agreed with the proposition that “Christians traditionally affirm the reality of a Creator God.” The survey also revealed that 86.21 percent agreed with the proposition that “Christians traditionally affirm that God is omnipotent and omniscient, and is actively and providentially involved in history.” Additionally, 89.66 percent agreed with the proposition that “In the Nicene Creed, the Christian faith affirms that the one God is a Trinity,” 96.55 percent agreed with the proposition that “At the Council of Chalcedon, the Church taught that Jesus Christ was God Incarnate,” and 92.86 percent agreed with the proposition that “The creeds teach that Jesus Christ was resurrected from the dead, which has traditionally meant that the tomb was empty.” Even on the Virgin Birth, there was no one who disagreed with the doctrine, although some 32 percent did want to interpret the language in a certain way.⁷

⁶ See John Shelby Spong, *Why Christianity must Change or Die?*, (London: Harper Collins 1999), p.46

⁷ Most of those who answered “other” — the 32 percent — wanted to stress that the doctrine of the Virgin Birth was not important for the idea of the Incarnation. One respondent wrote, “Some skepticism about “virgin”, but open to the idea; suspend judgment in practice.” This was fairly typical.

Our LGBT seminarians are clearly grounded in the tradition. They are, to use Alasdair MacIntyre's phrase, "tradition-constituted."⁸ They see how the tradition connects together. They affirm the key doctrines that make up the Christian worldview. They will want to train their congregations in the faith, to seek formation in Scripture, to ground the spiritual life in prayer, and to faithfully administer the sacraments.

Third, we discovered that they have a high view of Biblical authority. To the question whether they agree that "the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation," an overwhelming 86.21 percent answered in the affirmative. Those who did not answer "agree" still tended to have a high view of Scripture. For example, one respondent wrote, "They are the word of God as interpreted through human writers. They contain all things necessary for salvation but not necessarily everything." Interestingly, no respondent made an issue of those texts in Scripture, which are traditionally used to condemn acts of same-sex intimacy. Presumably, the 86.21 percent of respondents who affirmed the authority of Scripture have arrived at a settled mechanism of exegesis and interpretation that enables them to affirm the authority of Scripture while also affirming their own sexual identity.

Fourth, as these seminarians become priests, it is clear that in many respects they will be joining the advocates of orthodoxy in the Church. In response to a question about the Christian theology of other religions, over half of the respondents, identified as either

⁸ Alasdair MacIntyre, *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* (London: Duckworth 1988).

“exclusivist or inclusivist” (with a further 13.79 percent wanting to challenge the categories). There was nervousness about open table (with over half—53.57 percent—being opposed to the change in the canons).⁹ And in response to Cardinal Newman’s view of the Eucharist (Tract 90), only 17.24 percent totally disagreed with Newman. They have a high view of the sacraments.

The Implications for the Episcopal Church

It is clear that Spong is going to be disappointed. His support for the full inclusion of LGBT people in the Church is not going to be progress his theological agenda. Having worked so hard to be included, LGBT seminarians want to be included in the robust, traditional faith. They would be sympathetic to that criticism of liberal theology made by H. Richard Niebuhr, when he wrote, “A God without wrath brought men without sin into a kingdom without judgment through the ministrations of a Christ without a cross.”¹⁰ Our LGBT seminarians are not interested in a vacuous liberal theology that has no authority, no God, no Christ, and no sacraments.

Instead many of these seminarians would be excellent priests in even in more conservative congregations. They will preach the Gospel about salvation in Christ; they will exegete Scripture faithfully; and they will take the Sacraments very seriously. As

⁹ The Open Table question provoked the most comment. 46.43 percent did disagree with the canonical requirement for Baptism before participating in the Holy Eucharist. However, the vast majority of 25 percent of the ‘other’ answer wanted to make pastoral allowance, but not change the actual canonical requirement.

¹⁰ H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Kingdom of God in America*, New edition, (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press 1988), p.193.

they participate in national debates in the Church, we should expect a theological seriousness which will push back on the older liberalism of 1980s that saw 'inclusivity' as an end in itself.

The result, we suspect, is that over the next thirty years, we will see a gradual shift in the Episcopal Church to a center right theological position. Naturally, our LGBT priests are not going to advocate for a return to heterosexual marriage as the norm, although they do want to affirm the fundamental characteristics of Christian marriage—mutual fidelity, care, and lifelong vows. Furthermore, they will want to affirm the core doctrines of the Church, the need for salvation through Christ, and the dangers of open table. As a result, those on the right in the Church can expect some successes at General Convention; all thanks to their LGBT allies.

Homily for the Funeral of William Hoover Hethcock

ROBERT C. LAMBORN

John 11:21-27 (NRSV)

²¹Martha said to Jesus, "Lord, if you had been here, my brother would not have died. ²²But even now I know that God will give you whatever you ask of him." ²³Jesus said to her, "Your brother will rise again." ²⁴Martha said to him, "I know that he will rise again in the resurrection on the last day." ²⁵Jesus said to her, "I am the resurrection and the life. Those who believe in me, even though they die, will live, ²⁶and everyone who lives and believes in me will never die. Do you believe this?" ²⁷She said to him, "Yes, Lord, I believe that you are the Messiah, the Son of God, the one coming into the world."

“Lord, if you had been here, my brother would not have died,” Martha lays it on the line with Jesus. Yes, he tells her Lazarus will rise again, but she already knows about the resurrection on the last day, and it doesn’t seem to be helping her much. Then Jesus lays it on the line with *her*: “I am the resurrection and the life. Those who believe in me, even though they die, will live, and everyone who lives and believes in me will never die. Do you believe this?” “Yes, Lord, I believe that you are the Messiah, the Son of God, the one coming into the world.” Jesus takes the future promise of resurrection and expands it into present reality, asking, ‘Do you trust this?’ What Martha is able to say with complete honesty, in the midst of her grief and probably her anger, is, “I trust you.”

Martha is a woman who doesn’t hold back, who doesn’t just nod her head even to Jesus, but says exactly what she thinks. Reminds me of a certain woman in Bill Hethcock’s life! I wonder if that’s one reason he chose this passage. Had Martha greeted Jesus with limp platitudes—with the kind of passive piety Bill disliked—there would not have been this lay-it-on-the-line conversation expanding resurrection from future promise into present reality as relationship with Jesus. Bill is living that resurrection now, because he lived it here on earth. Somewhere in the course of listening to more than 4,500 student sermons—roughly 15 a week—Phebe asked him how in the world he could stand it! “I can’t think of any other job,” Bill told her, “where you get to engage the gospel fully on a daily basis.”

The Rev. Dr. William “Bill” Hoover Hethcock was a priest of the church for more than 57 years. Before coming to the School of Theology in 1979, he served parishes in North Carolina and Cincinnati and was director of program for the Diocese of North

HOMILY FOR THE FUNERAL
OF WILLIAM HOOVER HETHCOCK

539

Carolina. In Sewanee, he began as director of field education and sort of a utility infielder for the seminary—someone who can play a lot of different positions. At various times he taught parish administration, pastoral theology, canon law, Christian education, and ministry to the dying, among other things, and did a stint as acting director of Education for Ministry (EfM).

He got his start in the homiletics program assisting then-professor Edna Evans with evaluating student sermons in small groups. He continued to practice this discipline when he became professor of homiletics and when he taught at Virginia Theological Seminary during his retirement. Bill gave every student sermon his full attention and thorough feedback.

During and just after his 18 years at the School of Theology, Bill maintained his connection with congregational ministry. He served as interim rector in North Little Rock, Arkansas, as associate at Bruton Parish Church in Williamsburg, and even for a brief time as interim university chaplain here at the University of the South.

Bill gave of himself as an active member of the Diocese of Tennessee, making the more than 90-mile trip to Nashville time after time after time. He served on bishop and council, standing committee, and search committees, including the one that nominated Bishop Bauerschmidt. He continued to attend diocesan clergy events many years after it could be reasonably expected, and until very recently kept on teaching homiletics to people preparing to become deacons.

Bill was a vital participant in the life of Otey Parish. He served for 10 years on the Christian Education Committee and contributed to the work of rector search committees. He was

instrumental in the construction St. Mark's Hall at Otey. It was Bill's idea to name the hall to honor Sewanee's historically African American congregation. Bill was an associate of St. Mary, and for 35 years celebrated the Eucharist at the convent on Thursday mornings—celebrated *and preached*, that is.

God gave Bill Hethcock an abundance of gifts; teaching the craft of preaching brought those marvelous gifts together. He once said that if the seminary found out how much he loved it, they'd stop paying him! He developed, from Fred Craddock, a single-minded focus not on getting something *said* in a sermon, but on doing whatever it takes to get the sermon *heard* by the congregation. He was relentless in that commitment, teaching us how to get our sermons heard not in the church of the mid-20th century, but in the church of the late 20th and early 21st centuries:

- Make one point, that you can distill into one sentence.
- Preach on one reading.
- Make sure your examples support your point and don't overshadow it.
- Don't get in the way of your point with stories about yourself.

Bill wanted the dynamic effect a Scripture passage had on the people who first heard it first to be replicated in the sermon with the people who are hearing it now. "Don't tell them about it," he would say; "make them experience it!" viewing the sermon to be a kind of incarnation.

HOMILY FOR THE FUNERAL
OF WILLIAM HOOVER HETHCOCK

541

Bill was certain that the best preacher in The Episcopal Church was someone laboring away faithfully without recognition, bringing the “then and there” of the Bible into a congregation’s “here and now” week by week. He taught, not to make clones of himself, but to help us discover the style of preaching best suited to our own personalities and Christian lives. He helped us build a foundation of skills and habits to serve us through all of our years of ministry. Hundreds of Bill’s students share my gratitude to him. A number of us found homiletics the most difficult subject in seminary, yet Bill helped us improve every time we preached. After I came to Otey and he had to listen to me preach most Sundays, he was gracious, honest and insightful. Here I should admit Bill wrote that unless there was a good reason, funeral homilies should be short—5 to 7 minutes. To that I say Bill Hethcock is good enough reason for this homily to last longer!

Yet there is far more to Bill Hethcock than professional accomplishments and ministry in the Church. Bill loved Phebe and their family. When they married in 1972, he became stepfather to Carter, Mary Ellen, and Charles. He was steadfast with Phebe through the death of both sons, and has helped to raise grandson Tim in their home since he was a little over a year old. Bill was well-mannered, even courtly, yet humble and down-to-earth, referring to himself in course syllabi not with any of the ecclesiastical or academic titles he had earned, but simply as “Mr. Hethcock.” Even though his hair was gray to white for decades, he always had a boyish quality—a mischievous smile and a sparkle in his eyes that many of us saw turn to fire when right and wrong were at stake. He was plenty sophisticated, yet

straightforward and without guile. He was very intelligent and well-read yet spoke and wrote simply, never to show off. He was humble and self-effacing, yet had a deep confidence in what he thought and said. He was always gentle, while also firm and challenging.

Bill Hethcock lived a long and full life, even though we would have liked him to live more than his 85 years. Bill went through a melanoma scare in 1980 that had most people convinced he was going to die. At one point during his recovery from surgery and year and a half of chemo, he said, ‘Inside this sick body is a well person.’ The same could be said about the last few years of his life. His hearing loss reminded me of how Beethoven went deaf—both of them in vocations where hearing is so important! His car accident a few years ago left him with serious back pain, and moving around was always difficult after that, yet he kept going without complaining. As Bill’s body became sicker, eventually this well person with such a generous and loving heart was left with a physical heart that could no longer sustain his physical body. As long as he could fight, he had the courage to fight, and when he realized he couldn’t win his physical battle, he had the courage in his final days to stop fighting and simply love and be loved.

Bill chose the hymn we just sang because of what the last few verses express of his theology. How did, and does, Bill love Jesus Christ?

Not with the hope of gaining aught,
Nor seeking a reward;
But as thyself hast lovèd me,
O ever-loving Lord... .

HOMILY FOR THE FUNERAL
OF WILLIAM HOOVER HETHCOCK

543

Solely because thou art my God
And my eternal King.¹

“Don’t just tell it; make them experience it!” Jesus is resurrection and life, he tells Martha. Bill didn’t just tell it; even this afternoon he’s helping us experience it! “Inside this sick body is a well person.” Now God is raising this well person in a body that will never be sick again, and Bill gets to engage the Gospel of love on an *eternal* basis in the fullness of God’s presence. It’s a fullness his life and work made him ready to enjoy; it’s a fullness he rejoices that we will share in one day; it’s a fullness that surpasses ... if you can believe it ... surpasses *even* reflecting on 15 sermons a week!

¹ “My God, I love thee; not because,” *The Hymnal 1940*, 456.

Homily for the Funeral of Thomas Edward Camp

ROBERT C. LAMBORN

Isaiah 25:6-9 (NRSV)

⁶On this mountain the Lord of hosts will make for all peoples a feast of rich food, a feast of well-aged wines, of rich food filled with marrow, of well-aged wines strained clear. ⁷And he will destroy on this mountain the shroud that is cast over all peoples, the sheet that is spread over all nations; ⁸he will swallow up death forever. Then the Lord God will wipe away the tears from all faces, and the disgrace of his people he will take away from all the earth, for the Lord has spoken. ⁹It will be said on that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, so that he might save us. This is the Lord for whom we have waited; let us be glad and rejoice in his salvation.

“On this mountain,” we heard from Isaiah, “the Lord of hosts will make for all peoples a feast of rich food, a feast of well-aged

wines, of rich food filled with marrow, of well-aged wines strained clear." Granted, this passage from the Book of Isaiah refers to Mount Zion as the words celebrate God's ultimate victory and rule over all the earth, but when it suits my purposes I'm not above taking reference to a mountain in the Bible as an allusion to Sewanee! Thomas Edward Camp helped God prepare on *this* mountain a feast of rich food and well-aged wines in the form of a theological library.

When the Camps arrived in Sewanee more than sixty years ago, the School of Theology Library held less than 10,000 volumes. In those days, seminarians would borrow books from their professors, and it wasn't working as well in the 1950s when enrollment had doubled from its level before World War II. Ed became the seminary's first librarian fully qualified through professional education, something the School of Theology needed for its accreditation. St. Luke's Hall was being renovated and expanded when Ed came on July 4, 1957, and the library collection had been boxed up in the basement of Tuckaway dorm. "Only" 9,000 or so volumes didn't seem so measly when Ed, with one person's help, moved them out of that basement into what was then the new library space on the second floor of St. Luke's!

Immediately Ed set out to build up the collection, with the support of School of Theology Dean Alexander—Dean *George* Alexander at that time. By Ed's retirement in 1990, over 100,000 volumes occupied the School of Theology Library on the third floor of DuPont Library. But Ed didn't just buy books for the sake of buying books, he was careful to maintain the seminary library's identity while expanding into areas needed by updated curricula

This sermon was delivered on March 10, 2018, in All Saints' Chapel on the campus of the University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee.

and a changing church. Years ago, as the College expanded its offerings in the social sciences, a number of faculty in those areas were asking why the books they needed were over in St. Luke's Hall. The reason is that Ed was forward-looking in acquisitions in areas like psychology, sociology, and anthropology. Yet his broad vision never made him too busy to help individuals find the particular resources they needed for what they were working on.

New Testament Professor (now *emeritus*) Chris Bryan tells how he was working on his book on Mark's Gospel near the time Ed was retiring. Chris was trying to chase down an early article on the gospels as Greco-Roman biographies. The problem is that he didn't know the title of the article ... or the author ... or the journal it appeared in—just that it was some decades before. A computer whiz at the library searched online—something new in those days—and came up with list after list of possibilities, just not the article Chris was looking for. Chris had just about given up when he ran into Ed and mentioned his situation. Ed frowned, and thought for a few minutes. "Well," he said, "it may not be what you're looking for, but I *do* seem to remember ... it was in the *American Journal of Theology* I think... maybe about 1915... but I could be wrong ... let me see" Ed poked around in the stacks a while, then said, "Ah, yes, it *was* 1915!" With a smile, he handed Chris the 1915 volume of the journal, open to "The Gospels and Contemporary Biographies" by C. W. Votaw! Chris takes the moral of the story to be that one great librarian is worth any number of computers!

While Ed's vocation was librarianship, his much-loved avocation was music. Indeed, as he and Liz were getting to know each other at Louisiana State University, his musicianship was one

thing that attracted her to him. For some of his years at the School of Theology, Ed also served as instructor in Church music. In the course of Ed's many decades as a faithful member of Otey Parish, he was organist from 1960 to 1990, played for the children's and adult choirs, and saw to the introduction of *The Hymnal 1982* into the worship life of the parish. It is fitting that the most recent improvement and expansion of the organ at Otey was dedicated in thanksgiving for Ed's ministry as organist.

Ed served three terms on the Otey Parish vestry, including twice as senior warden. He co-directed the Sunday school, and served on a number of search committees. Ed was involved in the merger fifty years ago of Otey Parish and St. Mark's Mission Church, Sewanee's historically African American congregation. Ed's parish involvement overlapped with community involvement and commitment to justice, as he became one of the founders of Folks at Home and of the Sewanee chapter of the Episcopal Peace Fellowship.

Ed's commitment to causes of peace and justice went beyond his parish church and beyond the University gates. He joined in the march in Memphis after the assassination of Martin Luther King. He was one of the founders of the Cumberland Center for Peace and Justice and engaged in protests in Tullahoma and Oak Ridge, among other places. Before going to a protest, he and Liz would call to let Anne and Thomas know, "just in case we get arrested! Ed engaged in his activism out of his Christian discernment, taking into account both a passion to man the barricades and a strong sense of responsibility to his wife and children.

The vision in Isaiah is a feast not for some people, but for *all* peoples, and Ed would not be satisfied until that became true.

HOMILY FOR THE FUNERAL
OF THOMAS EDWARD CAMP

549

What's more, a feast is more than a vehicle for transferring a lot of food into people's stomachs. A feast is about conviviality and conversation. In addition to activism for justice on the large scale, Ed and Liz believed it was important to connect personally with African Americans as individuals. He and Liz would go to the Carousel Club in Winchester for drinks and food and conversation at a time when whites and blacks did not dine together in many establishments in the South.

From Isaiah we heard that the Lord God "will swallow up death forever," and "will wipe away the tears from all faces." It doesn't say there won't *be* any tears, but, given that there *are* tears, God will wipe them away. Even as we mourn the loss of Ed Camp, and we miss him, we give thanks for his long life, well lived, for his love of Liz, Anne, and Thomas, for his love of John, Nate and Dawning, and the love he showed people in general. He was curious to get to know others, and would interact with anybody he encountered. Sometimes this was frustrating to his family since it would take a lot longer to get somewhere because of the conversations Ed would strike up along the way! I knew him as someone who, in this age of multitasking, would pay attention to you—pay attention fully and joyfully. Even during his final hospitalization, Ed was asking the staff members who came into his room questions about their lives.

Ed loved to invite people he met to dinner, and the Camps' dinner table bore a feast that went beyond food. He was a wonderful conversationalist with a great breadth of knowledge, knowledge he developed as a habit. It was normal with his family at dinner, when the conversation went in a direction that required more information, for reference books to come out and share the

table with the plates and glasses. One of the Christian images for heaven is a banquet, and just as a feast is about more than consuming food, I am confident that the heavenly banquet Ed is now enjoying is a process of learning new things in deep communion with God and other people, because growing in the knowledge and love of God doesn't stop on this side of the grave. It's a good thing the new life God raises us to is eternal life, because, over the course of that heavenly banquet, Ed has more than a hundred thousand authors to get to know!

Poetry

Star-Bottom Boat

PETER COOLEY

1. you are my mapless journey on these tides
each morning expectation lifts, shoreless.
2. Your waves crash through each other colorless.
You shape the tints of too much longing stalled,
3. hues calling through each other to become
each other's rainbows, arcing, vanishing.
4. Little boat, my hopes are always in the wings
greeting us, trawling downward as they swoop,
5. these gulls, the terns, the pelicans on fire,
every morning a different conflagration.
6. Years back I threw away my compass, broke the wheel,
disremembered longitude and latitude.

7. On my best mornings midnight falls at noon,
the black streaks releasing constellations.

8. My luck? Little boat, it knows where we're going
and gods, my dark stars, I try to count and can't.

The Passing

WILLIAM VIRGIL DAVIS

The time has come and gone again
although we never knew it,
even though we were standing there

together and waiting, watching.
It passed us while we were there,
standing together in the rain,

and watching, waiting, expecting it.
The rain was not raining hard.
That hadn't bothered us, distracted us.

Still, it came and went quickly, quietly,
unobtrusively, while we waited,
watching expectantly, in the light rain.

The Barn Owl

ROB GRIFFITH

In the stillness after the wind, in the dark
that fills the house, the dog and I are up
for water, for respite from unquiet dreams,
the shapes that loom like adumbrated time
against the moon-churned waters of the mind.
But at the kitchen sink, dog bowl in hand,
I'm startled by a flash. Outside, a ghost
of feathers, beak, and claws hurtles down
and catches something small and soft in the grass.
It rises, arrows toward the house, and flares
its wings, a pale cross against the window.
Both dog and man tremble, martyrs to the night,
to signs and symbols hung among the trees.

A Declaration of Intent

SOFIA STARNES

He will not give us silence or dismay;
the word arrest will not endanger us
or leave us with a reliquary rose

too long inside its vase.

We will not see stray petals,
ambiguous avowals of a love that's loose-

arrayed and seasonal.

Of course, there could be mayhem,
one afternoon when everyone's agog

because the earth is shaking,
because a single fault—
too far for dispensation and denial—

has ripped the old foundations,
and instead, the rooms and rafters smell
like burning moss

and mosses smell like peat.

He will not let a fault—throat
of his own geography—speak out for him...

For this is what we need not fear at all:
that he will lead us blindly
through a gate, sidestepping stones

and strangers, stems as streets,
and take us where we do not know a soul.

Act of Worship

N. S. THOMPSON

They stand like silent ships moored at a wharf,
 Old shop fronts, many storeyed,
Gilt grimed with dust, but when panes catch the sun
 The mind imagines them a gun
Salute in flashes: ornate sterns that dwarf
 The street like galleons, multi-storied...

Brick bulwarks heaving with the strains they hold,
 The hold they have of strains,
These arks of knowledge, cut-down forests, trees
 Pulped mush and pressed out into seas
Of print for travellers to a land of gold...
 Such might be what the fancy entertains

When looking at these ancient chimney pots
 Glimpsed on a winding street
Or climbing up the creaking wooden stairs
 Feeling the buildings heave in pairs
Or bounce against each other, caught in knots
 While you, unsteady on your feet,

Rise in the gloom where naked light bulbs give
 No more light than a candle
And faded plaster rooms stacked up with books
 On tourism in Bedouin *souks*
To Tantric prints come shimmeringly alive
 And you, the long-haired pilgrim, sandal

Shod, crouch down by the shelves, intent on signs
 That beckon you like stars
Towards the forests, masts and wharves to dreams
 Along that pavement shore for gleams
Of some enlightenment seen in designs
 That lead to fictive Shangri Las

Away from these damp sinks of knowledge on
 A dusty city street packed tight
With bookshelves, figures bowing in an act
 Of worship at the learning stacked
Up, floor to ceiling, and then upright, gone,
 Like dark ships in the night...

Outside, the noisy cluttered pavement's show
 Contrasts with your young soul's communion
That revels in its fancy dreams and ache
 For knowledge, sunlit, as you take a break
From dank and flaky rooms where shadows bow
 As if to temple walls in union.

Book Reviews

Sewanee Theological Review 61:2

Singularity. By Christopher Bryan. Sewanee: Diamond Press, 2014. 247 pages. \$14.99 pb.

Christopher Bryan scores again! His new supernatural thriller is another page-turner. One of the reasons for his success is the wide range of his knowledge, an example of which is the title *Singularity*. I had no idea that the word had any meaning other than as a synonym for uniqueness, but he explains it as a term from theoretical physics: "It's a theoretical point in space time ... where gravity distorts time, space, and matter so much that you can't predict events by the normal laws of physics. Technology has borrowed the term to mean a theoretical point in the emergence of super-intelligence where you can't predict events because human minds can't comprehend such an intelligence" (86). The way this concept is developed in the story concerns the possibility of building computers that can comprehend such intelligence--and a mad scientist wants to build one so that he can download his intelligence into a robot in a way that will, in effect, make him immortal.

This infinite ego-trip is to take place in one of the institutions Bryan likes to put into his novels in which something that seems beneficent cloaks incredible evil. The United Nations Institute for Technological Experimentation and Development (U.N.I.T.E.D.) was being built in the village of Edgestow on land that had been the site of a freak earthquake in 1945, an area under the police jurisdiction of Exeter. It is that connection that ties this novel to the characters of Bryan's previous ones. Father Michael Aarons has married Detective Inspector Cecilia Anna Maria Cavaliere and

taken a parish in Exeter.

Small outbreaks of violence have occurred in Edgestow over the safety of the new project and conflicts between newcomers and old residents are more than the village's one constable can handle, so Exeter's police chief superintendent wants to send an eleven-member group of officers there for three months until permanent arrangements can be made. He wants Cavaliere to head the group; she will be promoted to detective chief inspector for doing that assignment well. She hates to leave Michael and their precocious three-year-old daughter Rachel for that long, and she has uneasy feelings about Edgestow, but her family encourages her to take the assignment. The staff she takes with her includes her brilliant younger friend Verity Jones and the wheelchair-bound Bahamian computer whiz Joseph Stirrup, with whom Verity is in love.

As they make their first efforts to investigate what is going on at U.N.I.T.E.D., Cavaliere and Verity accidentally reveal to the mad scientist that they know more than he thinks is safe for them to know, and they barely escape becoming specimens in his experiments, but how that happens and how they elude that fate should only be discovered by reading the story. Nor does the story end there, for it becomes apparent that all the evil in the institution does not proceed from him. These further revelations also involve some of the astute moral theology that Bryan likes to work unobtrusively into his plots. Thus there is a happy ending to the story except for some of the villains, making *Singularity* another pleasant reading experience from this author. One hopes that it will not be the last.

– O. C. Edwards Jr.

Sewanee Theological Review 61:2

Virginia Cary Hudson, The Jigs & Juleps! Girl: Her Life and Writings. By Beverly Mayne Kienzle. Bloomington, Ind.: iUniverse, 2016. xxii + 262 pages. \$30.95.

It was a delightful surprise recently to discover a connection between the authors of two very different kinds of books that I had greatly enjoyed reading at different periods of my life. The earliest was the school essays of a ten-year-old girl that were eventually put together as a book by one of her daughters, published after many rejections, and then spent sixty-six weeks on the *New York Times* Best Sellers list: *O Ye Jigs and Juleps!* by Virginia Cary Hudson (1962). The other was a source upon which I drew heavily for my history of preaching: *Women Preachers and Prophets through Two Millennia of Christianity*, edited by Beverly Mayne Kienzle and Pamela J. Walker (1998). Kienzle, who taught Latin and Romance Languages at Harvard Divinity School, is the author or editor of thirteen books on medieval preaching, especially that done by women, some of which treat Hildegard of Bingen. Her expertise in the area prompted me to enter into correspondence with her, eventually resulting in her providing a dust-jacket blurb for my history [*A History of Preaching* (2004)]. The connection between the two books is that the author of the first was the grandmother of the author of the second.

The granddaughter is also the author of the book under review, which tells the story of how the first book came to be published, how her mother edited it and got it published, and how the mother went on to defend her mother's childhood

authorship of the school essays and also published four small books of her mother's adult writings.

As interesting as all that may sound, the question may be asked of the appropriateness of reviewing such a book in a serious theological journal. There are a number of reasons. The first is that ten-year-old Virginia was at a church preparatory school, and most of the essays show how a number of church beliefs and practices appeared to a talented and spirited little girl. I enjoy reading them over and over. No wonder the Episcopal Book Club ordered 9,250 copies and chapters were published in a church news magazine of the period, *The Episcopalian*. Indeed, the book owes its publication to its advocacy to agents by the wife of Angus Dun, Bishop of Washington then.

Much of the pleasure of the book emerges from the way that, as the critic for the *New York Times Book Review* wrote, “[s]ome of Virginia’s thoughts sound as though Machiavelli had rewritten Emily Post – to the greater good and glory of all concerned” (89). To illustrate the point he quotes: “Etiquette is what you are doing and saying when people are looking and listening. What you are thinking is your business. Thinking is not etiquette.”

In addition to the fun of the reading, however (if you need further justification), there is the way *Jigs & Juleps* reflects the church at a parochial level during the period. One can add that the present volume is the work of a distinguished historian of the life of women in the church--to which it may be added that she is married to a priest, for whatever difference that makes.

This book, however, is not just an effort to reconstruct Virginia’s childhood. In later life, she said little about it that has come down to us, and she had no siblings to pass on their memories. So the new book goes on to tell of her adult life in a

way that shows Virginia to have been the bright and spunky sort of person who could have produced such compositions at an early age. She grew up to marry a trainer of racehorses, and the two of them traveled a good bit in this country, Central America, and Canada. But she also spent a lot of time in Louisville, where their home was, and she did a lot of public speaking, teaching a Sunday School class at her parish and doing occasional preaching not only there but also at the Goodwill and Salvation Army. Loyal Anglican that she was, she had a broad ecumenical view and even said on one occasion, "The new [view on] church unity for the Episcopalians is for the other churches to let *them* be boss" (226).

The book not only tells how many of her adult writings were published by her daughter in four additional volumes but also relates how devoted the daughter was to getting her mother's writings into print, especially to refute a number of readers of *Jigs & Juleps* who claimed that a ten-year-old girl could not have written it. Much of Kienzle's purpose in writing was to pay tribute to her mother's committing so much of her own adult life to the preservation of *her* mother's remarkable legacy. A possible effect of reading this volume will be that readers of it will set out to acquire copies of Virginia's writings. As she said: "O ye Sun and Moon, o ye beans and roses, o ye jigs and juleps, Bless ye the Lord. Praise Him and Magnify Him Forever. Amen."

– O.C. Edwards Jr.