

The Church of England: Evangelical, Catholic, Reformed, and Protestant

Churchman 077/1 1963

Gervase Duffield

On December 14 last year, during the course of a debate on the Church of England in the House of Commons, Mr. Tom Driberg described that church as “Catholic and Reformed”¹. As his speech developed, he used other contrasting adjectives to make the same point—Catholic and Evangelical, Catholic and Protestant. Mr. Driberg is not, of course, the first person to describe the Church of England thus, but his remarks prompt us to an examination of our Anglican heritage to see what precisely underlies these adjectives Catholic, Protestant, Evangelical, and Reformed. Such an examination will involve delving into the past, but not for mere purposes of antiquarianism. We may rather find that discovering our heritage afresh will provide pointers to solutions of problems confronting the Church today.

The sixteenth century is an appropriate starting point, not because anyone, except certain controversialists, imagines the Church of England began then, nor because the Reformers’ statements contain anything final in themselves, but because the Reformation settlement has shaped the general outline of *Ecclesia Anglicana* as she is today, and because the Reformers made a determined effort to recapture the purity of the primitive church.

Some scholars in recent years have sought to play down the religious issues of the sixteenth century. They interpret events in terms of constitutional changes, the rising tide of nationalism, social and economic shifts, political developments, and so on. Thus Dr. Elton, who edited the new volume of the *Cambridge Modern History* on the Reformation, describes the mainspring of the Reformation as political.² We cannot go into details here, but such an assertion quite ignores the continuing influence of the Lollards; and such “persistent playing down of religion at the expense of politics” has drawn a sharp and well deserved retort from Professor Gordon Rupp.³ Non-religious factors may have been neglected by earlier writers, but they are not the whole story.

Another group of writers regard the Reformation in England as very different from that on the Continent. They assert that the changes on the Continent were very radical, while those in England were comparatively small—consisting of getting rid of late medieval abuses, removing corruption and the tyranny of the Pope, but at the same time preserving continuity. On this showing Anglicanism is alleged to be something half way between Geneva and Rome.

Certainly many medieval abuses were removed. The vigorous preaching of Bishop Hugh Latimer shows a Reformer at work against these. Papal tyranny was also overthrown. The financial aspect of this tyranny had been a bone of contention on and off for centuries. The statutes of *Praemunire* also bear testimony to persistent anti-papal feeling in England, and Henry VIII even found support from Romish prelates like Gardiner when at last he threw off the yoke and established the Royal Supremacy. Yet we shall have cause to question this separation between the English and Continental Reformations, to look at the question of continuity, and ask whether a third group of scholars have not stressed a forgotten fact, namely, the doctrinal cleavage at the Reformation. For they view the Reformers as rejecting

the whole medieval ecclesiastical system, the Aristotelian subtleties of the Schoolmen, the mass which they considered blasphemous, a sacerdotal priesthood, and justification by a mixture of faith and works such as the Roman Catholics were teaching.

* * * *

From early days the Reformers had been known as the *Evangelici*, the Gospel men, those who stood for the *Evangelium* as against the *Pontificii*, those who followed the Roman Pontiff and his Scholastic system. The Reformers had been known as the *Evangelici* when they were still within the Roman fold trying to reform it. As this name indicates, they stood for the supremacy of the Evangel within the church. Most of these reforming leaders had been influenced by Renaissance humanism with its theme “*ad fontem et originem*”. In Italy this had led to a great revival of classical studies, but in northern Europe a theological revival accompanied the classical one. This revival sent men back to the sources themselves, and they soon began to realize that the primitive Church was different from the Roman one they saw around them. But the humanist influences among the Reformers were not confined to biblical scholarship, but they also produced great patristic scholars like Jewel, Cranmer, Ridley, Martyr, Bucer, Calvin, and Melancthon.

Because many who admire the Reformers today forget their patristic interests, perhaps Jewel’s comment on them is worth citing: “They were learned men, and learned fathers; the instruments of the mercy of God, and vessels full of grace. We despise them not, we read them, we reverence them, and give thanks unto God for them. They were witnesses unto the truth, they were worthy pillars and ornaments in the church of God. Yet they may not be compared with the Word of God. We may not build upon them: we may not make them the foundation and warrant of our conscience: we may not put our trust in them. Our trust is in the name of the Lord.”⁴

Here we can see the basis on which the Reformed Church of England was established, Scripture and the Fathers, with the latter much respected but carefully subordinated to the former. The Thirty-Nine Articles expressed the basic faith and the Prayer Book the liturgy of the national church, which was now independent of foreign interference and the dominion of the Pope. It appears that the Reformers did not think of themselves as doing anything different from their Continental counterparts, and in any case that is what we should expect when two groups of *Evangelici* set out to do the same thing, namely, establish once again the pristine purity of the early Church of the apostles. No Reformer ever thought of himself as setting up a new church. He simply sought to reform the one church founded by Christ, and this he did by appealing from the traditions of men to the authority of the Evangel. When a Reformer spoke or wrote of *nostra ecclesia* he meant not some separate church in the sense of a denomination, but the local church which had accepted the evangelical doctrine, and so proved itself a member of the true Church of Christ. The many churches of the Reformers were agreed on basic doctrine and therefore in communion. They were independent national or particular churches, and therefore at liberty to determine for themselves secondary matters, things indifferent on which Scripture was not clear. Such *adiaphora* included rites and ceremonies, matters of order, and church government.

Thus Edmund Grindal, later to become Archbishop of Canterbury but at that time Bishop of London, said in the course of examining certain Puritan troublemakers in 1567: “Well, all reformed churches do differ in rites and ceremonies, but we agree with all reformed churches in substance of doctrine.”⁵ Or again, John Philpot, Archdeacon of Winchester, examined

before Bonner, was asked about the church of Geneva. He replied: “I allow the church of Geneva, and the doctrine of the same; for it is *una, catholica, et apostolica*, and doth follow the doctrine that the apostles did preach; and the doctrine taught and preached in King Edward’s days was also according to the same.”⁶

Philpot was expressing the mind of the Reformers when he measured the catholicity of a church by the apostolicity of its doctrine in Word and Sacrament. The *Pontificii* did not regard the Reformers as catholic at all, but accused them of being innovators and schismatics. They termed them “Lutherans” early on because they said they followed Luther’s innovations. Nor did they like to admit that they were *Evangelici*, and in 1529 Erasmus, who had originally had some sympathy with the idea of going back to the Bible and the Fathers, but sheered off when he perceived its doctrinal consequences, wrote a book entitled *Against those who vaunt for themselves the title Evangelical*.

On another occasion Philpot was being examined by various bishops and doctors, and stated that he believed in one holy catholic church. One bishop said that Peter built the catholic church at Rome as was proved by the succession of bishops. Philpot replied: “Although you can prove the succession of bishops from Peter, yet this is not sufficient to prove Rome the catholic church, unless you can prove the profession of Peter’s faith, whereupon the catholic church is builded, to have continued in his successors at Rome, and at this present to remain.”⁷

Before the Archbishop of York at another examination he cited Augustine’s statement: “The church is called catholic, because it is thoroughly perfect, and halteth in nothing”. The Archbishop answered that it was catholic because it was for the most part universally received by all nations. To this Philpot said: “The church was catholic in the apostles’ time, yet was it not universally received of the world. But because their doctrine which they had received of Christ was perfect, and appointed to be preached and received of the whole world, therefore it is called the catholic faith, and all persons receiving the same, to be counted the catholic church.”⁸ The Archbishop stated that Augustine had tied catholicity to a succession of bishops and to universality, but Philpot said this was when the faith was pure and uncorrupted.

The apologist Bishop John Jewel took the same matter up with the Romanist Harding, who had cited Vincent of Lerins’ definition of catholicity—*Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*. Jewel says: “These general notes must be limited with this special restraint: Whereas the churches were not corrupted; for otherwise there was never any doctrine so catholic, no, not the confessed doctrine of Christ Himself, that hath been received evermore and everywhere and of all men without exception. For the Turks receive it not, and the Jews abhor it. And so the very Gospel of Christ itself by this rule should not be catholic . . . The catholic church standeth not in the multitude of persons, but in the weight of truth.”⁹

* * * *

Article XIX defines a true church as one which has soundness of Word and Sacrament. The same could be paralleled in other Confessions of Faith—Article VII of the Augsburg Confession of 1530, Article XI of the Confession of Saxony of 1551 written for the Council of Trent, Article XVII of the 1566 Confession of Helvetia, Article VIII of the 1573 Confession of Bohemia, and so on.

The Reformers, therefore, defined catholicity in terms of doctrinal soundness. They rejected the Roman charge of innovation, claiming instead that they were returning to the catholicity of the New Testament church, whereas Rome refused to abandon her abuses, corrupt traditions, and doctrinal perversions. The catholic faith of the Church of England was set out in her Articles, which deal with the Trinity (I-V), the Rule of Faith (VI-VIII), the Gospel (IX-XVIII), the Church, her sacraments and ministry (XIX-XXXIV), certain domestic Anglican regulations (XXXV-XXXVII), and civil duties with special reference to Anabaptist heresies (XXXVIII-XXXIX). More strictly, the first thirty-four Articles may be said to express the catholic faith as expressed in the Church of England.

Significantly, the first commentary on the Articles by Thomas Rogers, Chaplain to Archbishop Bancroft, is entitled *The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England*. In the preface Rogers writes: “Other doctrine than in the said Articles is contained, our Church neither hath nor holdeth, and other sense they cannot yield than their words do impart”. And many following agreed that the Articles expressed Anglican doctrine. The latitudinarian Bishop Burnet wrote: “The Thirty-Nine Articles are the sum of our doctrines, and the confession of our faith”. The high churchman Bishop Beveridge stated that the Articles “remain the constant and settled doctrine of our church”.

English and Continental Reformers alike regarded themselves as rediscovering the primitive evangelical catholic faith. They were one on basic doctrine, but whereas circumstances were different on the Continent, the English Reformers preserved as much of the old language as possible, while not compromising their theology. Their catholic continuity was with the New Testament doctrine, not the medieval church, and the Roman recusants were aware of the break at the time, even if the second group of historians mentioned at the beginning have failed to see it.

This concept of catholicity was not confined to the sixteenth century, but was held by the great majority of Anglican scholars right up until the middle of the nineteenth century when the concept began to change. Thus Archbishop Laud, an Arminian in theology and a distinct high churchman, in his controversy with the Jesuit Fisher denied that the Church of England was schismatic or sectarian: “And for the Protestants, they have made no separation from the general church, properly so called, but their separation is only from the Church of Rome, and such other churches as, by adhering to her, have hazarded themselves, and do now miscall themselves the whole Catholic Church.”

He is adamant that Rome is not the Catholic Church: “He (Fisher) tells us, ‘It is to be learned of the one holy, catholic, apostolic, always visible and infallible Roman Church’. Titles enough given to the Roman Church; and I wish she deserved them all, for then we should have peace. But it is far otherwise. ‘One’ she is, a particular church, but not ‘the one’, ‘Holy’ she would be counted; but the world may see, if it will not blind itself, of what value holiness is in that court and country. ‘Catholic’ she is not, in any sense of the word, for she is not universal, and so not catholic in extent. Nor is she sound in doctrine, and in things which come near upon the foundation too; so not catholic in belief. Nor is she the ‘prime mother Church’ of Christianity; Jerusalem was that—and so not Catholic as a fountain or original, or as the head or root of the Catholic.”

The main change in the understanding of catholicity comes with the Oxford Movement. Newman, writing an article on The Catholicity of the Anglican Church, says: “The Anglican view, then, of the Church has ever been this, that its separate portions need not be united

together, for their essential completeness, except by the tie of descent from one original . . . The Apostolic Succession is necessary in order to their possessing claim of descent.¹⁰ There is the main change. Catholicity is not now soundness in Word and Sacraments, though the Tractarians were zealous for orthodox doctrine against Liberalism, but rather apostolic succession because this guarantees validity in the eucharist. Newman discusses the Anglican claim against the Roman one, and summarizes: “Catholics believe their Orders are valid, because they are members of the true Church; and Anglicans believe they belong to the true Church, because their Orders are valid.” Newman wrote that looking back from his Roman position later, and he concluded that Lord Macaulay’s criticisms of Apostolic Succession told against Anglo-Catholics, but not against Roman Catholics.

* * * *

We have seen that the Church of England regarded her faith as evangelical because it bore witness to the Gospel, the evangel, and not to the papal errors. She regarded it as catholic because it continued the pure uncorrupted apostolic doctrine of the New Testament church, and rejected later accretions. Her faith was also distinctively Reformed. This word can have two senses. Firstly, it can mean that the reformed Church of England was associated with the general Reformation rediscovery of certain key biblical doctrines like justification by faith, original sin and the bondage of the will, the doctrine of the church visible and invisible, and so on. Whatever their differences on eucharistic theology—and it is doubtful if there was much among the early Reformers—all the great Reformers held these doctrines in common. Indeed, they formed a common Reformation heritage, as can be seen by comparing the various Confessions. On the first meaning, reformed is the adjective men used to cover this common area of doctrine, the Reformation faith rediscovered from the Bible.

The second use of the word Reformed comes from the seventeenth century, but as far as the present writer knows, it is not found earlier. During the Thirty Years War the custom grew up of dividing the Protestants, the *Evangelici*, into two groups—the Reformed and those who followed the Augsburg Confession. This division is set out in Article VI of the Peace of Westphalia, where certain Lutherans are said to be those *Augustanae Confessioni addicti* as distinguished from those *qui inter illos Reformati vocantur*. The latter description covered those who followed the teaching of Calvin and Melancthon, so that we can see they covered a wider group than those we should now call Presbyterians.

Professor W. A. Phillips has drawn attention to an interesting letter in the appendices of Rymer’s *Foedera*. The letter in Latin is from Queen Elizabeth to Ludwig, Duke of Wurtemberg and Teck. She had heard that the Electors and other Princes were planning to meet to consider passing legislation against those who seemed to differ from the Augsburg Confession. She stated that in view of the sufferings of Christians in Holland and France, such a conflict was dangerous to those who followed the Gospel. “We princes who profess the truth of the Gospel against the errors and heresies of the Papists may in a moment inflict a wound both on ourselves and on Christ.” Quarrelling should stop and be replaced by an alliance against the *pontificii*, “whose power grows and madness rages to excess.” She concluded by asking that if such a gathering comes off, she should not be omitted, as “we are also a member of the Church of God”.

Professor Phillips draws three conclusions. Despite her love for such things as copes and altar-candles, Elizabeth regarded herself as belonging to the true Church, which was coming to be known collectively as Protestant. Secondly, the “Lutherans” thought of her as a

Calvinist. Thirdly, if she thought of the Church of England as a bridge church, it was certainly not a bridge between Protestants and Rome, but between two groups of those “who professed the Gospel”.¹¹

Professor Phillips has shown that our Church of England is Reformed in both senses of the word. She certainly is one of the churches of the Reformation, and shares their common area of catholic doctrine. Though she herself is Calvinistic in the essentials of the faith, differing only from other Calvinistic or Reformed churches in matters of order,¹² she is a bridge church to other Protestants. The Articles are Calvinistic, as Dean Matthews has recently admitted,¹³ and if their Calvinism appears somewhat softer than that of other Calvinistic Confessions, this is due to two facts.¹⁴ First, the Articles were deliberately minimal, avoiding detail, and secondly, our Reformers were prudent enough to retain as much of the traditional language as possible without compromising their Reformed doctrine. Such a method of change proved pastorally wise, and avoided unnecessary disturbance among ordinary people.

* * * *

The Church of England is Evangelical, Catholic, Reformed (in both senses), and she is also Protestant. That word is anathema to some today, but this is because in their thinking it has become debased into a narrow negative anti-Romanism, which concentrates on mud-slinging. Such mud-slinging has, alas, gone on in both directions, but all Christians can rejoice that this is now almost a thing of the past. Historically and etymologically the negative understanding of “Protestant” is wrong. The word comes from the second Diet of Spire in 1529, where a minority felt themselves bound to draw up a protest against the reversal of the decision of the first Diet of Spire three years before. But their protest was primarily a positive affirmation of a fundamental Protestant principle: “There is, we affirm, no sure preaching or doctrine but that which abides by the Word of God. According to God’s command no other doctrine should be preached. Each text of the holy and divine Scripture should be elucidated and explained by other texts . . . We are determined by God’s grace and aid to abide by God’s Word alone, the Holy Gospel contained in the biblical books of the Old and New Testaments.”¹⁵

The Oxford Dictionary gives the meaning of protest in 1504 as “to declare formally in public, testify, make a solemn declaration”. It derives like its French equivalent from the Latin *protestari*, and hence in sixteenth century English a Protestant is one who makes a solemn public declaration. By the middle of the sixteenth century the word seems to have been in fairly common use in this country, though its most common use was by the Romans as a description of the Reformed faith. The Roman Catholic peer, Lord Montagu, referred in the Lords in 1562 to “the doctrine of the Protestants”. It seems to have been an alternative to “Lutheran” in Roman parlance, though gradually it was taken over as an honourable description of their own faith by those who held evangelical convictions.

In the sixteenth century a high churchman like Laud was not ashamed of the word Protestant.¹⁶ He declared himself innocent of trying to “overthrow the true Protestant religion established by law. He said that Protestants did but “protest the sincerity of their faith against the doctrinal corruption which hath invaded the great sacrament of the eucharist and other parts of real religion”. Laud was strongly Protestant in his eucharistic theology, and Jeremy Taylor even described Augustine as Protestant in this same respect. By this he meant that Augustine taught the doctrine which was subsequently to be recovered in the sixteenth century. In 1641 on the eve of the Civil War, Parliament, including seventeen bishops, made

the following declaration: “I do in the presence of God promise, vow, and protest, to maintain and defend, as far as I lawfully may, with my life, power, and estate, the true reformed Protestant religion expressed in the doctrine of the Church of England, against all popery and popish innovations”.

After the 1688 Revolution an oath was introduced in the coronation service to “maintain the law of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed religion established by law”. We have cited enough evidence to show that Protestant is an honourable term with a positive content, the basic ingredient of which is the supremacy and sufficiency of Scripture, as its first use in 1529 demonstrated. To those who regard the term as objectionable and merely anti-papal, we reply with Archbishop Benson that it is a word not to be forgotten, but to be understood.¹⁷

The faith of the Church of England, then, is Evangelical because it proclaims the Gospel, Catholic because it is in accord with apostolic doctrine, Reformed both because it partook of the rediscovery of biblical truth at the Reformation, and also because Anglicans are more nearly aligned with the *Reformati* than with the Lutherans, and Protestant because it affirms publicly and solemnly the absolute supremacy and finality of the Bible over tradition and all church teaching. Such a faith is set forth in the Thirty-Nine Articles.

* * * *

To analyse our heritage from the past is no mere exercise in antiquarianism, nor does such an analysis in itself settle all our problems with a final solution as unalterable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. Our Anglican faith as set out in the Articles is the work of great biblical theologians, but we should be disloyal to the Articles themselves if we did not set them under the Bible. It is conceivable that we might want to add to them to guard against some new error. It is also conceivable that some aspect might want altering, but only if it can be shown clearly and incontrovertibly from the Bible that they are in error at that point. Church history teaches us to be on our guard against every claim for new light. Sometimes new discoveries are wrongly interpreted, and sometimes their interpretation is a matter of dispute. Each must be treated with caution and firmly established beyond all reasonable doubt before it is considered. The Articles do not in themselves possess any absolute authority, but until they are altered on the basis of scriptural evidence they remain the distinctive and, so far as our church is concerned, authoritative doctrinal statement of Church of England theology. In conclusion we shall seek to point the relevance of this for two important subjects today, Prayer Book revision and ecumenical negotiations.

In the proposed revision of the Prayer Book (and also to some extent of the Canons) the Articles are in some danger of being by-passed, although one of the new canons says they “are agreeable to the Word of God and may be assented unto with a good conscience by all members of the Church of England”. The purpose of the present revision seems to be twofold: to bring up to date and to allow greater flexibility and comprehensiveness. With the first none will quarrel. With the second we need a little more caution. All can agree that some comprehensiveness and liberty is desirable, but the limits must be observed, or comprehensiveness degenerates into license. The doctrinal requirements of the Articles are minimal, when compared with other Confessions, but they do nevertheless mark out the limits of comprehensiveness. This was one of their purposes from the beginning, as can be seen from Archbishop Parker’s letter to Queen Elizabeth.¹⁸ Lest anyone think this was Parker’s private view only, the same point is made in Canon V of 1604 which explains their

purpose as being “for avoiding diversities of opinions, and for establishing consent touching true religion”. The Articles must therefore remain the doctrinal yardstick by which we test the revision both of the Canons and of the Prayer Book—not such an intangible yardstick as “the mind of the church” which is so often in practice a majority vote in Convocation or Church Assembly, or on the episcopal bench. If the church wants to revise its Prayer Book, nothing out of harmony with the Articles should be allowed to slip in. Just this has unfortunately happened with the new catechism.¹⁹ The same thing happened with the 1928 Prayer Book, where changes of doctrine were passed off as shifts of emphasis, to which the then Bishop of Norwich pertinently replied: “When does a change of emphasis become a change of doctrine? “A churchman may think the time for revision inopportune, but no churchman ought to oppose revision as such. What all churchmen should oppose is casual changes in doctrine by the introduction of elements out of harmony with the Articles. There is some cause for anxiety along these lines, despite alleged doctrinal safeguards in the Prayer Book measure.

It would be quite wrong, for example, for any revision to allow reservation, even as a permissible alternative, for it is against the Articles. It would be wrong to admit some of the things the Tractarians claimed were “catholic”, for they were against the natural historical and grammatical sense of the Articles also. Newman’s evasion in Tract 90 is well known, but it did not satisfy Newman himself for long. Writing to Dr. Jelf, Newman justified his approach thus: “The only peculiarity of the view I advocate, if I must so call it, is this—that whereas it is usual at this day to make the *particular belief of their writers* their true interpretation, I would make the *belief of the Catholic Church such*” (italics his).²⁰ What Newman did was to impose a standard of interpretation on the Articles which he had acquired from a somewhat lop-sided view of the Fathers. It was no more convincing than the seventeenth century forerunner Sancta Clara, and such interpretations must be firmly rejected in our current revisions, for they contradict the basic canon of historical interpretation, namely, interpretation in the light of the immediate context.

As Bishop Stillingfleet said of the Articles, “whatever the opinions of private persons may be, this is the standard by which the sense of our Church is to be taken”.²¹ The opinions of private persons or parties must not be allowed to make their way into our liturgy or formularies.

If an analysis of our heritage shows the limits of our comprehensiveness which should govern any revision today, it also has relevance to ecumenical problems. Professor Gordon Rupp asserts that the Reformers “had a strong sense of the unity of Christendom”. So they did, and some ecumenical ideals as well. The picture of them itching to leave Rome is an illusion. All the major Reformers had tried to reform from within and been turned out for trying. They were later much concerned for unity when the Anabaptist menace appeared. Their ecumenical ideal was a federation of national or area churches in communion with each other on the basis of doctrinal agreement set forth in their Confessions of Faith. (This was simply an extension to the national or area church, of the New Testament principle of one church to a locality, town, or city.) Every such church was to be autonomous and free to settle its own affairs in secondary matters, but remaining united with the rest on essentials. The principle is set out in its Anglican form in Article XXXIV.

Most ecumenical plans or unity schemes today seem to be centred primarily on the question of order. But is there not an avenue worth exploring along Reformation paths? There would be no loss of Reformed catholicity any more than there was in the sixteenth century. This sort of ecumenical plan would cut across the whole concept of denominational empires stretched

around the world. They seem to have grown up before anyone paused to think out the theology involved, but surely it is more Biblical, more Catholic, more Evangelical, and more Reformed to have one church to an area rather than a branch of the Anglican Communion, a branch of the World Presbyterian Alliance, and so on.

The Anglican Communion, even if we think it ought to exist as such, lacks an adequate doctrinal basis. Some provinces have the Thirty-Nine Articles and some do not. This is unsatisfactory, for the Lambeth Quadrilateral is an inadequate basis, and it is an open question whether its last point ought not to be reconsidered. Could not the Articles, less the domestic ones, be adopted for the basis of faith?

We began with the contrasts Mr. Driberg used in the House of Commons. I trust that this article has produced enough evidence to demonstrate that such words do not express contrasts so much as the same truth viewed from different angles. Pleas to make our Church more Protestant or more Catholic are beside the point. Our Church is certainly not perfect, but it is fully Protestant and fully Catholic. To suggest that it needs to be made either is to cast unjustified aspersions on the last four hundred years of our history. The danger today seems to be that we may lose what we already have by an intrusion of Anabaptist individualism on the one hand and an invasion of Roman sacramental excesses on the other.²² By all means let us modernize our Church in the right way, but let us not lose or distort our heritage. Let us reach out ecumenically in all directions. Let us seek reunion at home with those who have dissented from the church of the nation, and let us seek unity with Roman Catholics too, if we can persuade them to embrace a Catholic, Evangelical, Protestant and Reformed faith. We are not against unity with Roman Catholics, if our faith is not compromised, but, being realists about the vast doctrinal cleavage, we do well to follow the advice of the saintly Richard Baxter, and leave consultation with the Roman Catholics “until we are united among ourselves; and then for my part I think such an attempt to be pious and laudable”.

GERVASE DUFFIELD

Endnotes:

- 1) *Hansard*, vol. 669, no. 34 for Friday, December 14, 1962. Column 795.
- 2) *Cambridge Modern History*, new series, vol. 2, p. 228.
- 3) *Protestant Catholicity*, pp. 10f.
- 4) *Works*, vol. 4, p. 1,173. (Parker Society, as with other references to Reformers.)
- 5) *Remains*, p. 208.
- 6) *Works*, p. 153.
- 7) *Ibid.*, p. 37.
- 8) *Ibid.*, pp. 136f.
- 9) *Works*, vol. 3 pp. 266f.

- 10) *Essays Critical and Historical*, vol. 2, p. 18.
- 11) *The Protestant Reformed Church of England*, p. 4.
- 12) Dr. F. Kattenbusch in the article on the Anglican Church in *Herzog-Hauck's Realencyklopädie* classifies it as Reformed, differing from other Reformed churches in episcopacy and the royal supremacy. He attributes the Reformed influence to Bucer.
- 13) The 39 Articles, pp. 10ff.
- 14) Calvinistic in that they reject the Lutheran Consubstantiation.
- 15) Cited in *The Catholicity of Protestantism*, pp. 13f.
- 16) About the turn of the century "Protestant" began to be distinguished not only from the Papist but also from Anabaptist Puritanism.
- 17) Speech during his final tour of Ireland, in the course of which he died.
- 18) *Correspondence*, p. 400.
- 19) For evidence, see the article by J. I. Packer in *The Churchman*.
- 20) *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, p. 131, 1885 edition. I do not for a moment query Newman's integrity. Indeed, I think it a measure of the seriousness with which he took his churchmanship that Tract 90 was written at all—a last desperate attempt to prove he could be a loyal Anglican. I only wish some of his theological heirs took their churchmanship as seriously. I say "evasion" because he evaded the natural meaning of the Articles.
- 21) *The Unreasonableness of Separation*, p. 95.
- 22) The sacramental excesses are well known, but the Anabaptist individualism which threatens the unity of our national church is not so often recognized. The plea "live and let live" is in danger of being stretched so far as to overthrow the whole conception of a Book of *Common Prayer*, and replace it by a sort of episcopalian congregationalism in liturgy. Anabaptist individualism is also to be seen in the various attempts to turn the national church into a gathered sect, either puritan or episcopalian. The national church is surely the bulwark against either type of sectarianism.