

# Illustrations of Compromise in Church History

Churchman 102/3 1988

## D. A. Scales

This paper<sup>1</sup> looks at some situations in church history where compromise was sought, the issues involved, and the reactions of those who had to make decisions. Some resulted in a vindication of the truth, some in compromise—‘the arrangement of a dispute by concessions on both sides; partial surrender of one’s position, for the sake of coming to terms’<sup>2</sup>—acceptable in matters of Christian liberty, but unacceptable in matters of Christian truth. Particular attention is paid to the twentieth century, because ecumenical compromise is so strong a phenomenon now, and because we live in the light of actions taken earlier this century. The aim is to consider situations, not personalities, and we are conscious of our own weakness—‘let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall’.<sup>3</sup>

### The Arian Controversy

The Arian Controversy was the most important controversy of the fourth century.<sup>4</sup> A fundamental doctrine was being grappled with, which affected the very nature of Christian religion: the relation of the Saviour to the First Person of the Holy Trinity. The verbal differences were very small (though they represented very different theological positions), the significance of statements often lay in what was unsaid rather than what was said, and the cause of truth triumphed, in human terms, because those who stood for it were unwilling to compromise even when it seemed all the Christian world had gone after falsehood: pre-eminent among those who stood firm was Athanasius.

Both Athanasius and Arius belonged to Alexandria in Egypt. Arius began to attract attention about 318 by his doctrines. He taught that it was essential that the Godhead, which was unbegotten or uncreated, should be separate from all that was created or begotten. Arius argued that the Son of God could not truly be God, but must be a finite being; although created before the universe and before all time, there was nonetheless a time ‘when He was not’; being a creature, even though the first of all creatures, the Son, in Arius’s system, could not be of the same divine substance as the uncreated God. His error came from pressing the term ‘Son’ too far; applied to Jesus Christ, ‘not because it is fully adequate, but because it most nearly conveys . . . the relation between Him and the Father’ (Whitham). It expresses an unchanging and eternal relationship, not an act of generation or priority. It was possible to quote Scriptures which seemed to support the Arian view; Arianism fitted in with much current philosophical thinking, particularly in its tendency to separate God from his Creation.

When discussion on this issue increased, the Emperor Constantine decided to summon a general council, which gathered at Nicaea in 325. Standing against Arius and the Arians were Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, and his more famous deacon, Athanasius. The great majority were what historians have called ‘conservatives’: they were ready to condemn Arius, but were cautious and probably not able to perceive clearly what the exact issue of dispute was, and some were inclined to a modified Arianism. Arius’s views were pronounced heretical. The text that lay before the Council was acceptable in what it said, but not sufficiently explicit, and genuinely acceptable to Arians. To make the creed serve the purpose for which it was intended—a clear and unambiguous assertion of orthodoxy and rejection of heresy—the orthodox group boldly proposed the use of the Greek word *ομοουσιον* (‘being

of one substance’). This was accepted, and the Arians were defeated, but only in the first full-scale battle of a war.

In 328 Athanasius, who was about 32 years old, was elected bishop of Alexandria, a position he held until his death in 373. The campaign of the Arians had two main aims, to undermine and dispose of their chief opponents, and then, at a later stage, to undermine the Nicene formula. Although Arius’s works were proscribed in c.333, attacks against Athanasius were successful and he was formally deposed and excommunicated in 335, and the following year exiled:

Now some affirm that the Emperor came to this decision with a view to the establishment of unity in the church, since Athanasius was inexorable in his refusal to hold any communion with Arius and his adherents.<sup>5</sup>

Athanasius returned late in 337 with the Emperor’s permission: in all, he endured five exiles, the longest being seven years. During one exile he wrote some of his most important works, including his masterpiece, the four great *Oration against the Arians*: as one historian wrote—‘his exile was more disastrous to his enemies than his years of victory’.<sup>6</sup>

In the year 341 the so-called ‘Dedication’ Council issued some creeds, and a new period in the controversy began, a period of doctrinal reaction—which was to send forth some eighteen creeds, all of which sought to rid the church of the ‘being of one substance’ (ομοουσιον) formula, and substitute some other teaching. This council took a median position, seeking to conciliate those who did not sympathize with Arius but disliked the word ομοουσιον: the doctrinal downgrade had begun.

In 345 a council at Antioch used for the first time the phrase ‘like in all things’ to the Father (ομοιον . . . κατα παντα). This formula, because of its ambiguity, later became the watchword for the main Arian party; while it could include ‘like in essence’, and therefore represent a semi-Arian/semi-orthodox position, it admitted evasion, and came to mean by use that the Son was divine in a sense, but neither coequal nor coeternal, inasmuch as likeness implies a measure of unlikeness.

In the 350s Arianism gathered further momentum: within its broad grouping there were three main sections. The first was that of the semi-Arians, who were descendants of the waverers at Nicaea; they were for the most part orthodox, but were also afraid of taking a decided line. They would have liked to substitute ‘being of like substance’ for ‘being of one substance’. A second section wanted the word ‘like’ as the test word: this they declared to be scriptural, and it could of course be used in an orthodox sense, but it was useless as a test of orthodoxy. A third group were those who carried on Arius’s teaching logically and maintained that the Son was ‘unlike’ the Father.

In 357 a creed, usually called the ‘blasphemy of Sirmium’, was produced, which declared that the Son was ‘unlike’ the Father. This creed, however, marked a turning point, for it revealed the Arian heresy as it had never been revealed before: it split the groups within the Arian camp—the extreme Arians disgusted the semi-Arians.

The Council of Ariminum in 359 ended up in endorsing the standard Arian position—‘like’. Jerome remarked of this council: ‘the whole world groaned and was amazed to find itself Arian’.<sup>7</sup> But this Council cleared the air: it was now plain that the final conflict would be

between two parties—that of Athanasius and that of official Arianism. The semi-Arians would have to make up their minds which side they were on. Athanasius proved himself to be a man of great stature and wisdom, for he was able to discern who radically disagreed with him, and who disagreed in minor issues or terminology, and he sought to bring the latter gently to a Nicene position:

we discuss the matter with them as brothers with brothers, who mean what we mean and dispute only about the word.<sup>8</sup>

So in the late 360s the semi-Arians indicated that they were willing to subscribe the Nicene formula: semi-Arianism disappeared from history.

From 371 onwards there was a time of violent persecution, in which the emperor Valens tried to promote Arianism by brutal means. In May 373 the great Athanasius died, without seeing the triumph of his cause. Other leaders like Basil of Caesarea carried on his work. With the accession of pro-Nicene emperors the way was prepared for the triumph of orthodoxy. An edict of Theodosius in 380 spoke of ‘the single Deity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, under the concept of equal majesty and of the Holy Trinity’.<sup>9</sup> The Council of Constantinople in 381 re-established the Nicene faith as the doctrinal statement of the church.

The use of the formula ‘being of one substance’ in the Nicene creed was important because it was not capable of being glossed in an Arian fashion. Edward Gibbon made merry that only one iota separated truth from error: but compromise and confusion were excluded by the use of a term which was so distinct in its meaning. The faithful church today needs to seek to express scriptural truth with equal clarity.

Athanasius was the unflinching and persevering champion of orthodoxy, even when it seemed he had the whole world against him; despite many difficulties and five exiles, nothing induced him to compromise his aim—the adoption of the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity by the Christian Church throughout the Roman world. Do we have in contemporary evangelicalism a similar willingness to persevere in defence of the truth ‘against the whole world’, a willingness to endure exiles, so to speak, rather than compromise our confession? Such is the challenge of Athanasius.

Athanasius had at once the clarity of perception to see what was essential for the preservation of the doctrinal truth for which he fought, with the breadth and magnanimity to discern how close some of those who opposed him were to his position. We need that same discernment today as we seek to convince many who as yet do not see the nature of the doctrinal crisis facing the Church of England.

### **Agreement on Justification? – The Colloquy of Ratisbon, 1541**

Roman Catholicism and Biblical Protestantism are each a complete religious system; a different foundation has led to a different superstructure. The attempt to find common ground between the two systems, to make a synthesis of two diametrically opposite sets of teaching, must be absurd; they present a choice—a conflation is not possible. Outside an era of ecumenical pressure this has nearly always been clear. There were, however, some attempts at compromise of this sort in the Reformation era, and the most important instance was the Colloquy of Ratisbon in 1541.

In the years after the Diet of Augsburg in 1530 the attitude of the Church of Rome had to some extent changed; instead of reactionary intransigence—objecting to Justification by Faith as a dangerous novelty—the Roman party were now apparently prepared to adopt the doctrine as their own, and to make it appear that there was no radical difference between the two parties which might not be solved by conference and some concession. Politically it suited the Emperor to make religious peace in his empire.

It was in such a climate that the Emperor Charles V opened the Diet of Regensburg or Ratisbon in 1541. Charles thought that public discussion of religious differences in the diet would not be productive; so he decided that the best plan would be to establish a Colloquy (in today's jargon, an International Commission) and himself appoint the theologians who would be members. The three Roman Catholics were John Faber Eck, John Gropper, and Julius Pflug; and the three Protestants were Philip Melancthon, Martin Bucer, and John Pistorius. The Emperor had chosen shrewdly as nearly all these men, though in varying degree, were disposed to concord. The Emperor furnished a text—which was in fact the work of Gropper, with some of the ideas of Bucer incorporated.<sup>10</sup> The text on Justification was entirely rejected, and the colloquy for the first but not the last time nearly broke up; but then a new article on justification was drafted and was accepted by all the collocutors. So representative theologians of the Roman Church and of the Protestants purported to agree on the crucial doctrine of Justification. This attempt to effect a compromise between the two antagonist systems and to harmonize them could only be brought about by leaving out of view, or explaining away, or confusing what was distinctive in either doctrine.

Much of the Article<sup>11</sup> contained the substance of the Protestant doctrine and seemed to reveal large concessions by the Roman theologians:

no man can be reconciled to God and delivered from the bondage of sin, save through Christ the only mediator between God and man

we are justified . . . by this faith so far as it is the instrument whereby we take hold of that mercy and righteousness which is imputed to us for Christ's sake and his merit's sake: not for the worthiness of the righteousness which is communicated unto us in Christ.

But the Article spoke ambiguously on one point in particular, 'which was of such vital and fundamental importance that, according to the sense in which it was understood, it would determine the whole character of the article'.<sup>12</sup> In the Protestant doctrine *faith* is the means of justification, the instrumental cause, because it appropriates Christ's righteousness and consists of an entire reliance on Christ alone; but in the Roman doctrine faith justifies the sinner

by being, in its own essential nature as one of the 'fruits of the Spirit', and by producing, in its actual operation as a vital principle which 'worketh by love', a real inherent righteousness, which is, on its own account, acceptable to God, . . .—in short, by *making him righteous*.<sup>13</sup>

Two key sentences in the statement give some definition of faith: 'a sinner is justified through a lively and efficacious faith';<sup>14</sup> and 'the faith which justifies is that which worketh by love'.<sup>15</sup> These definitions are ambiguous. The phrase 'through a lively and efficacious faith' could be variously interpreted: with the concept of efficacy introduced alongside faith, the adversaries of the Protestants could immediately proceed to ascribe to the fruits of this efficacy, as well as to faith, the office of justifying. True Protestant teaching has always kept distinct the justification of the believer by faith, and the inward renewal worked in the

believer (sanctification), for they are logically separate. Luther characterized the article as ‘botched and unsatisfactory’.<sup>16</sup>

The other phrase was: ‘the faith which justifies is that which worketh by love’. This is taking up Galatians 5:6: ‘For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love’. But it is necessary to differentiate the different functions of faith—as Tyndale told More:

The faith in Christ’s blood, of a repenting heart toward the law, doth justify us only; and not all manner faiths. . . . all faiths be not one faith, though they be all called with one general name.<sup>17</sup>

Luther made some valuable comments on coupling the concept of faith with love:

The corruption . . . of the Gospel is, that we are justified by faith, but not without the works of the law. . . . For they say that we must believe in Christ, and that faith is the foundation of our salvation, but it justifieth not, except it be furnished with charity. This is not the truth of the Gospel, but falsehood and dissimulation.<sup>18</sup>

Commenting specifically on Galatians 5:6, in a letter which discussed the Ratisbon article on justification, Luther stated:

That passage does not treat of justification, but of the life of the justified. It is one thing to be *made* righteous, and another to *act* as righteous; one thing to *be*, and another to *do*. Even schoolboys distinguish between *active* and *passive* . . . It is one question, How a man is justified before God, another How a justified man acts. It is one thing for a tree to be produced, another for it to bring forth fruit.<sup>19</sup>

Luther thought the document the most harmful writing ever composed.<sup>20</sup>

Only once does the article refer to justification by faith *alone*: the key word which guards against error is absent from the main text, thus allowing faith to be coupled with love in good works in justification.

There is a great deal of material, which while true in its correct context is irrelevant, and therefore at best misleading, in the Ratisbon article on justification. Much that actually relates to sanctification has obtruded itself into an article which purports to speak of justification.

It diverts the mind from the external object of justifying faith, which is Christ alone, and His perfect righteousness; and directs it to the inward effect of faith, in changing the character and conduct of the sinner, and producing an inherent, but imperfect, righteousness of his own.<sup>21</sup>

At the very point where for the Protestant doctrine clarity is essential, confusion had been introduced.

There is a doctrine of double justification: this speaks of an inherent or infused grace, poured into man’s heart by the Holy Spirit, whereby righteous works are done; but because this righteousness of man is necessarily incomplete, he needs to supplement the inherent righteousness (which is partly God’s work and partly man’s) with the imputed righteousness of Christ. According to this doctrine, two righteousnesses are required for the sinner to gain heaven. Professor H.M. Chadwick, a member of A.R.C.I.C. II, sees this as the basis of the original Ratisbon article, and, incidentally, as the hope of reconciliation between the two

doctrines today.<sup>22</sup> There are certainly passages which seem to confuse, even fuse, justification and sanctification, and imply that the justified man is the sanctified man.

Buchanan derives a number of lessons from this event. First, the conspicuous change in the stance of the Church of Rome, and that in a short period of time; second, the possibility of appearing to concede almost everything, while one point is reserved which is sufficient to neutralise every concession; third, the folly of trying to reconcile two systems which are radically opposed by a compromise between them; and the great danger of private conferences with a view to this, rather than defining the truth in the open field of controversy.<sup>23</sup> To these may be added the danger of adding irrelevant material and thus confusing things which differ.

Such lessons are always relevant, but never more so than in the wake of the Agreed Statement on justification, entitled *Salvation and the Church*, published by A.R.C.I.C. II in 1987.<sup>24</sup> Here there are many apparent concessions, but yet explicit statements that we are justified *only* by the righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ, and that we are justified by faith *alone*, are not found. For a document which is intended as a study of justification the statement comprehends much material which is not immediately relevant—the title ‘Salvation and the Church’ indicates this—and one feels the concept of justification is almost lost sight of, as in paragraph 13 where a vast array of terms relating to salvation in the New Testament is set out.

Most insidiously, justification and sanctification are linked, confused, and fused—though particularly by Newman’s concept of the creative word, which was of course not present in the Ratisbon article.

Faith is not defined, though it seems to be used more to mean an assent to truth than trust in a person. Paragraph 10 contains a passage about faith, the concepts of which are familiar after a study of Ratisbon:

Faith, therefore, not only includes an assent to the truth of the Gospel but also involves commitment of our will to God in repentance and obedience to his call; otherwise faith is dead (Jas. 2.17). Living faith is inseparable from love, issues in good works, and grows deeper in the course of a life of holiness.<sup>25</sup>

Like the Ratisbon article, A.R.C.I.C. II appears to make some remarkable concessions—one is indeed amazed that some Roman Catholic theologians are willing to make them: but if the key question is asked, whether this document is an accurate, clear, and full description of the Biblical doctrine of justification, the answer is definitely, ‘No’. The task of finding common ground between two opposite systems is an impossible one. Luther declared that the 1541 Ratisbon article was an example of Christ’s words—‘a new patch upon the old garment, by which the rent will be made worse’.<sup>26</sup> The same is true of the 1987 statement.

### **Evangelical bishops debate about sacerdotal vesture (1912)**

The English Reformers’ change in belief led them radically to alter not only the text of services, but also the furnishings of buildings and the apparel of ministers. The wearing of a surplice for all services was the universal practice of all ministers of the Established Church from 1559 till the Oxford Movement. The surplice had no doctrinal significance—it was merely a distinctive clerical garment. There was no distinction made between Morning and Evening Prayer on the one hand and Baptism and the Lord’s Supper on the other—the

vesture was the same because the character of the function of the ministry was the same, and because the ministry of the sacraments is always an adjunct of the ministry of the Word.

With the increasing influence of the teaching of the Oxford Movement the illegal use of sacerdotal vestments spread comparatively widely, so that early in the twentieth century approximately one in ten parish churches in England used them. The next illustration of compromise in church history is from a debate in the Upper House of York Convocation in 1912, when—as a consequence of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline (1906)—the proposal was put forward that

a distinctive vestment, that is to say, a white chasuble, with a white alb plain, be permitted to be worn by the chief minister at the Holy Communion.<sup>27</sup>

There were to be safeguards, chief among these being ‘That no alteration of the doctrine of the Church of England as set forth in Articles 28, 29, 30, 31, is hereby intended’. Particular interest attaches to the debate in that, while several evangelical bishops opposed the motion, one—Handley Moule of Durham—supported it. Cosmo Gordon Lang, then Archbishop of York, recollected

the good wives of Bishops Moule and Chavasse leading their lords up and down the lawns at Bishopsthorpe on the morning before the question of permitting white vestments was to be decided, pleading with them to be faithful to their true evangelical tradition.<sup>28</sup>

Moule’s speech commented on the irony that he was seconding a resolution which would legalise attire connected with doctrines of the Holy Communion which were certainly not his convictions; his action had already cost him one greatly valued friendship, and had no doubt shaken the confidence of multitudes; as an individual Christian and Churchman he stood exactly where he had stood, when ordained, in regard to holy communion.<sup>29</sup> He addressed himself to the state in the church at that time:

To let things go on as they were was not merely dangerous but tended in the opposite direction of either worse anarchy or the calamity of disaster or disruption<sup>30</sup>

He looked therefore for a middle way, and regarded the proposal as one that might meet ‘a large number of the wiser and more temperate-minded men of the present ritual school’ without greatly displeasing many evangelicals and broad churchmen. His argument took an inclusivist attitude to parties within the church, approached the problem pragmatically, and regarded ‘disruption’ as a thing to be avoided at all costs. Again an inclusivist view was seen, when he stated that ‘violence should not be done to any loyal element in the Church of England’. The logical chasm had been crossed when ritualists could be called a loyal element in the Church.

this was one of the occasions on which a great sacrifice of personal preferences, which did not involve a sacrifice of sacred convictions, might be what one was called to, and what was the right offering to lay upon the altar of the will of God.<sup>31</sup>

It is difficult to see how Moule’s position did not involve a sacrifice of sacred convictions: though admitting the irony of the apparent inconsistency of his position at the start, he did not present any case which really squared his actions with his convictions.

It seemed to him tacitly confessed on all hands that toleration was the one possible policy.<sup>32</sup>

Again the argument is pragmatic, and also facile—courses other than the one he mentioned could have been considered.

He was not enthusiastic about the proposal before them, but he felt a conviction and hope about it<sup>33</sup>

So he pressed, in his own words, for ‘the line of reconciliation’. It was a sad moment. E.A. Knox wrote:

There lives in my memory to this day the tragedy of the misery depicted on the face of Bishop Handley Moule when he consented to this alteration. It was flatly contrary to all the traditions in which he had been educated, contrary to his teaching as Principal of Ridley Hall at Cambridge, contrary to his own personal convictions, and costly in the sacrifice of many cherished friendships, from which this action permanently alienated him.<sup>34</sup>

E.A. Knox, the Bishop of Manchester, moved an amendment, which recommended no change in the official position and sought protection for ‘parishioners from any unauthorised use of such Ornaments in parish churches’.<sup>35</sup>

No declarations or provisions could evacuate their decision of its true importance:

The value of a symbol was that which worshippers attached to it. . . . The Eucharistic vestments had been the symbol of the tenets of the Catholic party<sup>36</sup>

It was impossible to dissociate in the minds of loyal churchmen ‘the Eucharistic vestments from the teaching that the priest was a sacrificing priest offering upon the altar the memorial of the sacrifice of Calvary’.<sup>37</sup> This point was of the first importance: no saving clause could in fact undo or neutralise the association which a symbol had attached to it; the same remains true today.

Knox was a man of keen mind: he saw, and pointed out, the much wider issue which this compromise was attempting to ignore, but in fact merely deferring.

The time must come when they would have to say ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ to the whole system which they demanded.<sup>38</sup>

So often proposed compromises appear to relate to little things; but frequently they are in fact manifestations of much greater issues, which need to be settled, not avoided. And so he called them to resolute action:

In these days it was usual in the political and religious world to cover a retreat by calling it an act of statesmanship. They had bitter fruit to gather still from statesmanship, which was neither more nor less than an abdication of authority, by those to whom God entrusted it, and from whom an account of their trust would be required.<sup>39</sup>

Dr. N. D. J. Straton, Bishop of Newcastle, in seconding the amendment, declared that ‘It was futile to talk of divesting such externals of doctrinal significance’,<sup>40</sup> also referred to the ‘alteration as regards the whole order of ministerial duties which permission to wear a chasuble and alb would inevitably entail’.<sup>41</sup> Referring to the character of the Ordinal he asked:

Could any thoughtful man fail to notice the prominence thus given to the ministration of God's Word, and the primary duty of the clergy to teach it?<sup>42</sup>

If, in the face of the Reformers' emphasis on the primary importance of the ministry of the Word, they should assign to one sacrament a mark of distinction over and above the ministering of the Word and the other sacrament,

surely it would be useless to say that that House intended no alteration thereby in the doctrine of the Church of England<sup>43</sup>

The situation which now exists, where some may wear distinctive vesture for holy communion, produces confusion as to the character of the ministry in the whole church. Such allowance transgresses the bounds of comprehensiveness and becomes mere inclusiveness.

Dr. J.W. Diggle, Bishop of Carlisle, declared that the question of vestments could not be isolated from other matters, as the militant advocates of the vestments intended and hoped to modify, if not to uproot, the doctrines of the Church of England as the reformers interpreted them.

He had heard their leaders say that the Reformation movement was a movement to be lamented with tears and to be deplored in dust and ashes<sup>44</sup>

Diggle also objected that the alteration of the ministerial character implied by the vestments proposed 'would militate against the revealed proportions of the faith, exalting the ministry of the Sacraments above the ministry of the Word'.<sup>45</sup> The right solution to the crisis before them was not to allow this distinctive vesture which taught the unreformed doctrine of the mediaeval church:

what they ought to do was one and all to set themselves resolutely to correct and to undo the teachings which had led to the revival of this vestiarian controversy<sup>46</sup>

One argument which came frequently from supporters of concessions to the ritualists was the great danger that some disruption, separation, or schism might result if the ritualists were not allowed, at least to some extent, to do what they wanted to do. Moule treated it as axiomatic that disruption must be avoided at all costs. Diggle also dealt with this question:

he would keenly deplore any rupture in the Church of England. Still, there were worse things than rupture. The amputation of a limb was better than paralysis and death of the whole body; moreover he was far from being sure that rupture would be avoided by the adoption of this proposal.<sup>47</sup>

Dr. F.J. Chavasse, Bishop of Liverpool, advocated united action by the bishops to check the anarchy and to restore discipline. If no man were ordained without a written promise not to wear vestments and no curate licensed to a church where they were used, they would soon disappear:

I know that such drastic measures would call forth a storm of abuse and of opposition . . . I know that there would inevitably be a certain number of secessions . . . but I am convinced that there would be even more silent secessions on the other side if Vestments were legalized in the Church of England.<sup>48</sup>

When the vote was taken five bishops voted for and five against. Lang, the archbishop, did not exercise his casting vote as he thought that it ought to be left on record that the House was in fact equally divided. The Protestant and evangelical case had been put in some fine speeches, which drew out the definite doctrinal significance of the vestments, the importance of correct teaching as to the character of the ministry, and the solution to the problem in correcting doctrine, enforcing discipline, and not being afraid of secessions.

Bishop Moule, though a saintly man, was probably out of his depth in ecclesiastical affairs: his speech was sentimental rather than theological; it marked a simple yielding to pressure; and it put its trust in safeguards which would soon be forgotten. E.A. Knox wrote of the attempt to contain ritualism by legalizing white vestments: ‘These good Bishops were like men trying to turn tigers into tame cats by feeding them on buns.’<sup>49</sup> But Moule was a recognized leader and widely trusted—his action dismayed many, and must have misled others.<sup>50</sup> His vote in support of vestments meant that the amendment of Knox and Chavasse was lost; he kept one house of Convocation from sounding an authentic Reformation voice in the crisis.

The arguments used are relevant today. Though the Vestures of Ministers Measure of 1964 legalized these vestments, with a clause to safeguard doctrine, the vesture is not acceptable to those who are Protestant and evangelical. Its significance remains the same; the clause negating doctrinal significance, while a bastion against the overthrow of the Church of England’s official doctrinal position, cannot alter this. The situation is unsatisfactory. We await the time when the Church will come to a better mind. It cannot for ever halt between two opinions (though one of the claims and assumptions of today is that this is precisely what has been achieved).

One particular contemporary area of concern is the use of, and the attempt to impose, a white stole at ordination. This sacerdotal garment was reintroduced by the Oxford Movement; it also makes statements about the character of the ordained ministry which are foreign to Scripture and our Church formularies. When in the 1950s Bishops Wand and Kirk refused to ordain men who would not wear a stole, the protests that ensued caused Archbishop Fisher to declare that ‘no candidate should be refused ordination on the grounds of his being unwilling to wear a stole’. When the Vestures of Ministers Measure was discussed in the House of Lords in 1964, Archbishop Fisher stated:

I think it is inconceivable that any of the Bishops would press an ordination candidate, contrary to his conscience, to wear a stole at his ordination. I believe it to be inconceivable.<sup>51</sup>

But what Archbishop Fisher in his apparent simplicity found inconceivable is in fact happening. It is aided by a rubric in the Alternative Service Book Ordinal that states:

Where it is agreed that those to be ordained are to be clothed in their customary vesture, it is appropriate that this should take place at any time after the Declaration.

This is typical of an A.S.B. rubric: it is not stated who are parties to the agreement, and what is customary vesture. But it is certain that there is immense pressure to make stoles the norm for ordination. We cannot compromise on this: it is an issue of profound significance. The use of a stole speaks of the whole character of the ordained ministry and pronounces it sacerdotal; and it is because of this that every form of suasion is used, even though reference to what ‘is agreed’ may make it seem to be a matter where uniformity will not be pressed. As

E.A. Knox said, the time will come when we shall have to say 'Yes' or 'No' to the whole system which the Oxford Movement has sought to impose on the Church of England. If evangelicals temporize with this question, or ignore it, they will effectively say 'Yes'.

### **The challenge of Liberalism – The debate within the Church Missionary Society (1922)**

The divergence of opinion among supporters of the Church Missionary Society, which occurred in the first two decades of this century and reached its crisis in 1922 with the formation of the Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society, centred on the character and authority of Holy Scripture. The Church Missionary Society, founded in 1799, had at its Annual Meeting in 1868 made its view of destructive criticism of the Bible plain, declaring that any departure from the Society's 'Protestant and Evangelical principles'

whether in the direction of a Rationalistic theology, or of the doctrines and practices which the Church of England rejected at the Reformation, will be fatal to the cause of Missions both at home and abroad, as substituting 'another Gospel' for the 'Gospel of the grace of God'.<sup>52</sup>

By the turn of the century theological liberalism had affected a number of evangelicals, which is not surprising when it is recollected how widely liberalism held sway in the universities, and there arose a group, now termed liberal evangelicals, who rejected inspiration and were 'modernists' in other doctrines.

The resignation of Prebendary H.E. Fox as honorary clerical secretary in 1910 marked the end of an era. His successor was the Rev. C.C.B. Bardsley, who

believed that the future of CMS lay in a broadening of relationship both between the Church of England and in the ecumenical contacts that developed rapidly after the Edinburgh conference<sup>53</sup>

which was held in 1910.

J.E. Watts-Ditchfield, Bishop of Chelmsford from 1914, and T. Guy Rogers, Vicar of West Ham from 1917, were members of the 'Group Brotherhood', which was later known as the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement, the organization which represented liberal evangelicals. Meetings at West Ham Vicarage led to the presentation of a liberal evangelical memorial, usually called the Chelmsford Memorial, as Watts-Ditchfield presented it to the C.M.S. General Committee in November 1917; about three-quarters of the signatories were thought to be closely associated with the Group Brotherhood. This asked the C.M.S. to endorse three propositions:

(i) that C.M.S. 'gladly accepts the services of all who are attracted by its tradition and who [are] striving to interpret evangelical truth in accordance with the Holy Spirit's guidance in each succeeding age';

Scripture does not appear in this statement, so that the definition of 'evangelical truth' is open-ended.

(ii) that 'the Society, while adhering firmly to its own principles, works in co-operation with other communions, and welcomes fellowship with societies representing other schools of thought';

Here was not merely cordial relations and civilized behaviour, but co-operation and fellowship with those who preached another message.

(iii) that ‘the Society’s position with regard to revelation and inspiration is defined for it simply by the formularies of the Church of England; and that no further restriction or definition of belief in these subjects is sought for from its candidates, agents or supporters’.<sup>54</sup>

Bishop Knox recorded that, when he showed this memorial privately to Archbishop Davidson, the archbishop replied: ‘Why, this document will split the Society asunder’.<sup>55</sup>

Eleven days after the memorial was presented, the Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen was founded (on 22 November 1917): one of the Terms of Basis formulated at the December meeting succinctly dealt with the key issues in the coming debate:

We believe in the essential deity of our Lord Jesus Christ together with the infallibility of all his utterances as recorded in Holy Scripture.<sup>56</sup>

A counter-memorial, which opposed the plea for greater comprehensiveness in C.M.S., largely the work of the Rev. Daniel Henry Charles Bartlett, Vicar of St. Nathaniel’s, Windsor, Liverpool, was presented to the C.M.S. committee in December, 1917.

A sub-committee produced a report, popularly known as the Concordat, which the C.M.S. General Committee adopted in February 1918. On ceremonial it was stated that while the north end position for the minister at holy communion was the normal practice, the use of the eastward position, which had been declared not illegal, when visiting another church must be left to the individual conscience.<sup>57</sup>

The Section on the Authority of Holy Scripture was lengthy: it spoke of ‘Holy Scripture as the Revelation of God mediated by inspired writers, and as holding a unique position as the supreme authority in matters of faith’; it noted that ‘in Articles vi and xx, inspiration . . . is attributed to Holy Scripture as a whole’; and it declared that ‘our use and treatment of the Bible should be in harmony with His’ [Christ’s].<sup>58</sup> It went on to deal with the issues of scholarship and the selection of candidates. Here it suggested that the student of Scripture, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, should

take into the fullest consideration every light that scholarship and saintliness can furnish.

With regard ‘to the special difficulties of students and young people at the present time’:

personal devotion to Christ as Lord and Saviour should be a primary condition for acceptance, and . . . such doctrinal definitions as are more appropriate to maturer years should not be required.<sup>59</sup>

It is easy to see how both sides thought that their position was safeguarded in this document. Conservative evangelicals felt that the orthodox view of Scripture was preserved in the initial doctrinal statement (though in fact this did not exclude the views of liberal evangelicals) and that declarations about scholarship and candidates should be seen in the light of this. Liberal evangelicals found the statements on inspiration sufficiently general to be acceptable, and saw the section on scholarship and candidates as a charter of freedom. R.L. Pelly (who had in 1907 been the first ‘reforming president’ of the Cambridge Inter-Collegiate Christian Union) wrote:

It is a great declaration of freedom—freedom in respect of biblical criticism, ceremonial, and co-operation with other societies.<sup>60</sup>

The sub-committee was not seeking a compromise—the parties were not deliberately surrendering part of their position for the sake of coming to terms; and yet as a document the Concordat was a compromise. It failed to thrash out the basic theological problem, and allowed ambiguity on issues which both sides thought were of fundamental importance. Professor Bromiley's judgment 'that suspicion on both sides among the rank and file jeopardised the success of the Concordat from the very outset'<sup>61</sup> does not take account of this failure and misplaces the blame. The Concordat was a faulty document, incapable of bearing the weight that would be put upon it: it brought no peace.

As far as the conservatives were concerned the situation did not in practice improve. In the summer of 1919 the Rev. E.W.L. Martin, a C.M.S. missionary, preached a series of sermons in Hong Kong, which included such classic liberal assertions as:

That thoughts ascribed to Adam, Noah, Abraham, and Moses were really Jewish conceptions of times as late as 450 B.C. That the story of Jonah was obviously based on the Babylonian myth of the dragon Tiamat. That Christ's acceptance of these Old Testament records was simply an evidence of His own limitations.<sup>62</sup>

In 1921 C.M.S. Headquarters instructed the heads of the Society's training institutions to adopt an attitude of 'impartiality' between the views which maintained and the views which contested the trustworthiness of the history of the Old Testament.

There was also unrest and division on the mission field. Thus Dr. W.H. Griffith Thomas, who visited China in 1921, wrote:

I know of two C.M.S. theological institutions where the men in charge are definitely on the critical side . . . there were two schools of missionaries, the fundamental difference between them being whether or not the Bible can be trusted.<sup>63</sup>

The Bible Union of China had been formed to unite those who accepted Scripture and traditional views of its inspiration and authority.<sup>64</sup> It is clear that the issues which the Concordat failed to settle, and which were in need of resolution, were not unimportant minutiae but fundamental truths.

The Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen decided that the issue must be brought to a head by the proposing of a resolution at the C.M.S. General Committee; the date was fixed for 15 March 1922; and the Rev. D.H.C. Bartlett was chosen to propose it.<sup>65</sup> The two main points which were at issue in the motion, and in all the debates and voting during the year, were: the trustworthiness of the historical records of the Bible; and the truthfulness of all Christ's utterances. Liberal evangelicals were willing to accept the trustworthiness and authority of Scripture in faith and morals, but not in historical matters: this is in fact an impossible dichotomy because the Christian faith is based on historical events—one cannot separate the virgin birth and the bodily resurrection, for instance, from the Gospel, as all liberalism has been willing to do. Liberal evangelicals were willing to speak of 'the mind of Christ' and the 'teaching of Christ' without accepting the truthfulness of all Christ's utterances in Scripture; again, following classic liberalism, their own preconceived view of 'the mind of Christ' would determine which of Christ's utterances in Scripture were, in their view, true—whereas all the utterances of Christ in Scripture, being true, should shape our view of the mind of

Christ. The motion, then, was a good motion, since it clearly brought out the issues which it was intended to bring out.

The 425 who attended the March meeting were not willing to come to a decision immediately, and the issue was postponed till July. On 12 July 1922, an even larger gathering considered a slightly revised motion asserting the same two vital points. As many speakers seemed concerned about the loss of episcopal patronage and the horror of disruption, Dean Wace insisted that the main question was—on what conditions were men to be trained and sent out to the heathen? Late in the day Bishops Knox and Chavasse produced an amendment which was a great improvement on the original one proposed by a liberal evangelical leader—but it omitted the two vital points which were the essence of the F.E.C. motion. The F.E.C. motion stated that

the character of Holy Scripture as the Word of God involves the trustworthiness of its historical records and the authority of its teachings<sup>66</sup>

whereas the second amendment referred to

the supreme authority of Holy Scripture and its trustworthiness in all matters of faith and doctrine as God's Word written<sup>67</sup>

The F.E.C. motion declared that 'our Lord, Whose utterances are true, endorses that authority and trustworthiness', whereas the second amendment made no specific mention of Christ's utterances. Mr. Bartlett and Dean Wace, among others, could not accept the amendment; but it won the day.

The text of the amendment which was finally approved itself furnishes an important lesson in a consideration of illustrations of compromise. If one reads it afresh, without any knowledge of its context, it can sound like a fine, conservative statement, which asserts the authority and trustworthiness of Holy Scripture; but given its context and its omission of the two vital matters at issue, it is a worthless compromise text or a permission for theological liberalism. It is the stance it took on the matters which were actually under debate which is the only significant thing. This is a standard to apply to current statements—in particular the A.R.C.I.C. statement on justification has much in it which is fine sounding, but irrelevant to the vital issues.

The F.E.C. Committee resolved to form an organization which adhered to the principles of the founders of the C.M.S.; and thus on 27 October 1922, 'amidst an impressive scene, hallowed by prayer, the Committee called into existence the Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society'.<sup>68</sup>

Meanwhile the C.M.S. Committee at its August meeting had accepted on 'special agreement' a candidate who had an open mind on the virgin birth, but did not disbelieve it. There was one last opportunity for the C.M.S. position to be set right, when a subcommittee appointed on 12 July reported back in November. Sir Thomas Inskip, the Solicitor-General, sought to have the phrase which referred to the Scriptures' 'trustworthiness in all matters of faith and doctrine' changed to refer simply to their trustworthiness, thus changing qualified acceptance to absolute acceptance. This crucial amendment was lost by 210 votes to 130.<sup>69</sup> An amendment (formulated by Bishops Ingham, Knox, and Chavasse, Dean Wace, and Mr. Gladstone) adding the words 'We believe in the absolute truth of His teaching and utterances,

and that His authority is final' was proposed; but Canon Guy Rogers said that such a statement, of belief in the truth of all Christ's utterances, would put him out of C.M.S. and the Honorary Secretary, C.C.B. Bardsley, declared that such an expression 'would split the Society from top to bottom and lead to the resignation of missionaries in Asia'. The offending words 'and utterances' were withdrawn.<sup>70</sup> Again, then, the C.M.S. Committee produced a statement which sounds fine, but the significance lies in what is not said, and an understanding of its context reveals its true import.

The separation was unavoidable and right. The Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen correctly identified the root of the problem (in a wrong attitude to Scripture) and its seriousness, and pressed home a fair motion to make the C.M.S. decide where it stood. We must honour the faithful stand of our forefathers and pray that we too may be found faithful in not compromising with liberalism. Not for the first time in this study it is seen that those who are faithful to Scripture and will not compromise must be willing to be separate. Pluralism is a way of spiritual death.

### **The 'new evangelicalism'—Compromise with ecumenical pluralism**

The last illustration of compromise from church history is a contemporary one: it is the position of evangelicalism in the Church of England today—which is the fruit of a change in the 1960s. The Rev. John Stott stated, in his chairman's Introduction to the 1967 Keele Congress Statement that the Congress 'has meant for many of us not a change of fundamental position, but of stance and even of direction'.<sup>71</sup> The good faith of that statement is not challenged, but hindsight enables one to see what many feared at the time: that a change of stance, and even of direction, has led to, or perhaps more accurately was the result of, a change of fundamental position.

Let us put the situation in its context by considering an address given by Dr. J. I. Packer to the Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen's Spring Conference in 1961, entitled 'The Theological Challenge to Evangelicalism Today'.<sup>72</sup> This will furnish a clear view of evangelicalism before the great change took place.

By way of introduction Dr. Packer stated that he meant 'by evangelicalism in the first instance adherence to a definite position, on which one's churchmanship, evangelism, and pastoral practice is based'. In reference to his title he declared that 'A theological challenge is issued to evangelicalism whenever the Church loses, or threatens to lose, its grip on the gospel, or whenever Christians cease to walk according to the truth of the gospel'. All these tendencies, stated Dr. Packer, appeared in modern dress and issued a theological challenge: in the ecumenical outlook.

The dominant factor in the present Church situation is undoubtedly the ecumenical outlook. This has popularly given rise to the idea that Christian truth has been 'fragmented', by reason of the divisions of Christendom, into a series of isolated and partial 'insights', at present scattered abroad through the various theological traditions within the Christian Church; and that what is needed is to gather them all together and construct from them a grand synthesis in which all will find a place—a sort of theological rissole, or Irish stew. The common ecumenical estimate of evangelicalism is that it is one among these many traditions, due to be assimilated into the larger whole.

The consequences of this ecumenical outlook are twofold: first, a greater respect for some of the things that evangelicals have to say; but, secondly, that evangelicals must be prepared to

listen to and learn from other traditions, and thus join in an advance to the richer ecumenical theology.

The suggestion is that evangelicalism should be regarded, and should learn to regard itself, as one tradition among many, both in Christendom and in Anglicanism, and that the way ahead is for evangelicalism to be assimilated into a larger whole in which all traditions unite.

Should we accept this estimate as a basis for discussion with non-evangelicals? Dr. Packer's answer could not have been more explicit:

We should not. On the contrary, in all such conversations and exchanges we should seek to maintain and vindicate the following two principles. (1) The first principle is that *evangelicalism is Christianity . . .* (2) The second principle . . . is that *evangelicalism is Anglicanism*.

If evangelicals fell into the pit, it was not because they were not warned.

Since the mid-1960s many evangelicals have taken the ecumenical view, that evangelicalism is one insight among many. They have joined those who do not make a clear choice between theological systems, but seek a synthesis of them all: this is, of course, to sell one's theological birthright for a mess of ecumenical pottage. Not doctrine and principle, but policy and expediency, rule in their dealings; pluralism, which will make no clear statement on the errors of Anglo-Catholicism, holds sway—and pluralism is a broad path which leads to destruction.

The first national evangelical Anglican congress, held at Keele in 1967, was a significant indicator. In referring to Keele, I am aware that there was a considerable degree of stage management; that a very substantial statement was brought before a very large number of people in a very short time; and that the statement was not approved by all. The congress was, however, an indicator of a new stance, a new direction, and a new fundamental position—that of acceptance of ecumenical pluralism.

In the Section entitled 'The Church and its Unity' are several statements which are straws in the pluralistic wind; though on occasion they seem to be safeguarded by their context, they have proved to be the principles on which post-Keele evangelicalism has worked. In the subsection entitled 'Dialogue' and in paragraph 84, which is entitled 'Learning Together', one sentence reads:

Polemics at long range have at times in the past led us into negative and impoverishing 'anti'-attitudes (anti-sacramental, anti-intellectual, *etc.*), from which we now desire to shake free.<sup>73</sup>

We must not bow to the current fashion of regarding 'negative' as an unpleasant and undesirable word. It is often impossible to state a truth with clarity and precision without some negative statements, particularly in defining boundaries; many ecumenical agreed statements rely for their 'agreement' on ambiguous positive statements with no negative corollaries. Nine of the ten commandments are negative.

Note how the past is caricatured by reference to 'negative and impoverishing "anti"-attitudes (anti-sacramental, anti-intellectual, *etc.*)'. Is this true? To whom do they refer? Were the Reformers, or the Puritans, or the fathers of the Evangelical Revival, or Victorian evangelicals, or our forbears this century anti-sacramental or anti-intellectual? To state the

question is to realize the absurdity of the idea. F.J. Chavasse wrote with regard to 'Communion Sunday' in the 1850s:

My father would be extra quiet all day, and shut himself up in his room both before and after the service. I have seen him come down from the rails with tears in his eyes.<sup>74</sup>

If one compares that description with the sacramental practice of today, which is impoverished? Consider the names of ten evangelical theologians of the century 1840-1940: Goode, Litton, Girdlestone, Boulton, Dimock, Ryle, Moule, Knox, Griffith Thomas, and Hammond. They mark the theological and intellectual vigour of evangelicalism. Compare this with the last twenty years: which era is theologically effete and intellectually impoverished?

The key to all this is elsewhere in the sentence: 'from which we now desire to shake free'. To be aligned with the evangelical heritage, to stand in the evangelical succession, would foreclose any true participation in the ecumenical outlook; classic evangelicalism would not mix with ecumenical pluralism. So Keele evangelicalism had to distance itself from classical evangelicalism: 'we now desire to shake free'. A change of stance, a change of direction, *and* a change of fundamental position!

This accounts for the reference to penitence which occurs quite frequently. The introduction states that 'The mood of the Congress was one of penitence for past failures'.<sup>75</sup> Phrases like 'we confess' or 'we confess to our shame' occur;<sup>76</sup> in the section entitled 'The Church and its Worship' a whole paragraph is devoted to 'Our failures'—and it is no surprise that amidst that sorry catalogue 'we have been slow to learn from other parts of God's Church'.<sup>77</sup> Now, I am not denying the imperfection of evangelicals past and present—no one who believes in original sin would! But this corporate, public penitence for the more distant past is suspect: here again Keele evangelicalism was shaking free. This is a sophisticated form of dissociation from the past. It may sound fine and seemly, but the effect is the same as if it had been more candid: Keele evangelicalism is criticising, and dissociating itself from, the outworkings of classic evangelicalism.

But how does this relate to truth, to the classic formulations of Biblical teaching in the 39 Articles? Are these the 'attitudes' from which Keele was shaking free? Were the evangelicals in the past right or wrong about the Articles? That is the key issue. For if they were right, then there is no room for ecumenical pluralism; and if Keele has shaken free from them, then indeed there has been a change of fundamental position.

We recognise that in dialogue we may hope to learn truths held by others to which we have hitherto been blind, as well as to impart to others truths held by us and overlooked by them.<sup>78</sup>

This statement was a classic enunciation of the ecumenical outlook against which Dr. Packer warned in 1961; ecumenical pluralism was swallowed hook, line and sinker. The result was inevitable: any acceptance of pluralism results in the minimization of doctrine.

In the paragraph entitled 'Facing the Future' we read: 'We are deeply committed to the present and future of the Church of England.'<sup>79</sup> Classic evangelicals always have been deeply committed to the Church of England, because of its doctrine and liturgy—as was stated above, evangelicalism is Anglicanism. On face value, therefore, there is nothing new in this avowal. It would surely have been better—bearing in mind 'the chaos in doctrinal matters'

referred to in the previous paragraph—to have expressed commitment not to the Church of England at large, but to the Church of England in her true character, as expressed in her historic formularies. The Keele statement is entirely open-ended. And what does it mean to express deep commitment to the *future* of the Church of England? The ecumenical outlook has won.

The ecumenical pluralism of which Keele was the signpost has left evangelicalism with a legacy of disastrous compromises—the experimental services, *Growing into Union*, evangelicals formally present at mariolatrous shrines at Walsingham and Willesden, acquiescence in A.R.C.I.C. statements, the Nottingham statement ten years later, and the Alternative Service Book. In all these matters evangelicals have acquiesced in doctrine contrary to their profession. Northumberland’s words in Shakespeare’s *Richard II* ring through the mind:

Wars hath not wasted it, for warr’d he hath not,  
But basely yielded upon compromise  
That which his noble ancestors achieved with blows:  
More hath he spent in peace than they in wars.<sup>80</sup>

For the last twenty years most of evangelicalism has been in a compromising position. The 1960s leadership did not have the courage, it seems, to continue on the narrow path. Of course, this compromise is labelled a triumph:

It is usual in the political and religious world to cover a retreat by calling it an act of statesmanship. We have bitter fruit to gather still from statesmanship.<sup>81</sup>

The evangelical movement needs to shake free, not from its heritage, but from the ecumenical outlook; to recover its doctrine and to assert again its doctrinal identity. We need to repent—but not of the beliefs and deeds of our forefathers; no, we need rather to repent of the compromise of the 1960s and its bitter fruit in the last twenty years. Then by God’s grace we shall go on to assert the true Protestant, Reformed, and evangelical character of the Church of England.

Lord Macaulay wrote: ‘Logic admits of no compromise. The essence of politics is compromise.’ So it is in Christian affairs. The essence of ecclesiastical politics, of ecumenism, is compromise; but Christian truth admits of no compromise. Ecumenical pluralism is not the answer; it has been tried and been found wanting. As E.A. Knox said of the Oxford Movement, we may say of the Oxford Movement and of Liberalism:

The time must come when we will have to say ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ to the whole system which they demand.<sup>82</sup>

**D. A. SCALES** is Senior Classics Master and Director of Studies at St. Lawrence College, Ramsgate, and a member of Church Society Council.

Endnotes:

- 1) This paper was read on 2 September, 1987, at the Autumn Conference of the Protestant Reformation Society at Homerton College, Cambridge: 'Ecumenical Compromise—The Ecumenical Movement: Its Method, Aims, and Object'.
- 2) *Oxford English Dictionary*.
- 3) 1 Corinthians 10:12.
- 4) This first section was based on lectures written in great haste some years previously: if it contains any unacknowledged quotations, the plagiarism is unintentional!
- 5) Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, I. 35. 4; quoted at J. Stevenson, *A New Eusebius* (1957), p.388.
- 6) A.R. Whitham, *The History of the Church* (1931), p.220.
- 7) Jerome, *Dial. contra Lucif.*, 19.
- 8) Athanasius, *De Synodis*, 41; quoted at J. Stevenson, *Creeds, Councils and Controversies* (1966), p.43.
- 9) *Cod. Theod.* XVI, 1. 2; quoted at Stevenson, *CCC* p.160.
- 10) Hastings Eells, 'The Origin of the Regensburg Book', in *The Princeton Theological Review*, XXVI (1928), pp.355-72.
- 11) *Corpus Reformatorum* IV (= Melanthonis Opera IV) (1837), coll. 198-201; most of this is reproduced at B.J. Kidd, *Documents illustrative of the Continental Reformation* (1911), pp.343-4. English translation at: Miles Coverdale, *The actes of the disputacion . . . at Regensburg* (1542), xvii-xxi.
- 12) James Buchanan, *The Doctrine of Justification* (1867), p.132.
- 13) *Ibid.*, p.133.
- 14) *per fidem vivam et efficacem iustificari peccatorem*.
- 15) *fides quidem iustificans est illa fides, quae est efficax per charitatem*.
- 16) Quoted at: John Scott, *The History of the Church of Christ*, I (1826), p.278.
- 17) H. Walter (Ed.), *An Answer to Thomas More's Dialogue by William Tyndale* (1850; Parker Society), pp.196-7.
- 18) Martin Luther, *Galatians* (James Clarke; 1953), p.98.
- 19) Luther and Bugenhagen to the Elector Johann Frederick, May 10 or 11, 1541; at *Martin Luthers Werke* (Weimar edition), Briefwechsel IX (1941), p.407, II.40-42 and 44-46.
- 20) Eells, *op. cit.*, p.371.
- 21) Buchanan, *op. cit.*, pp.133-4.

- 22) H.M. Chadwick, 'Justification by Faith: a perspective', in *One in Christ—A Catholic Ecumenical Review*, XX (1984). pp.191-225. Cf. B. Hall, 'The Colloquies between Catholics and Protestants, 1539-41', pp.257-9; in G.J. Cuming and D. Baker (Edd.), *Councils and Assemblies* (1971), pp.235-66.
- 23) Buchanan, *op. cit.*, pp.135-7.
- 24) *Salvation and the Church: An Agreed Statement by the Second Anglican—Roman Catholic International Commission* (1987).
- 25) *Ibid.*, p.14.
- 26) *Martin Luthers Werke* (Weimar edition), Briefwechsel IX (1941), 407, II. 19-21.
- 27) *The York Journal of Convocation, containing the Acts and Debates of the Convocation of the Province of York in the Sessions of May 8th, 9th and 10th, 1912* (1912), p.129.
- 28) J.G. Lockhart, *Cosmo Gordon Lang* (1949), p.215.
- 29) *The York Journal* (ed. cit.), p.134.
- 30) *Ibid.*, p.135.
- 31) *Ibid.*, p.136.
- 32) *Ibid.*, p.136.
- 33) *Ibid.*, p. 137. Cf. *op. cit.* (1909), pp.50-54, and *op. cit.* (1911), pp.182-4.
- 34) E.A. Knox, *Reminiscences of an Octogenarian* (1935), pp.311-12.
- 35) *The York Journal* (ed. cit.), p.141.
- 36) *Ibid.*, p.144; p.145.
- 37) *Ibid.*, p.146.
- 38) *Ibid.*, p. 145.
- 39) *Ibid.*, p.143. Cf. *op. cit.* (1909). pp.59-62.
- 40) *Ibid.*, p.155.
- 41) *Ibid.*, p.148.
- 42) *Ibid.*, p.148.
- 43) *Ibid.*, p. 149. Cf. *op. cit.* (1909), pp.62-68.
- 44) *Ibid.*, p.194.
- 45) *Ibid.*, p.198.
- 46) *Ibid.*, p.199.

- 47) *Ibid.*, p.200. Cf. *op. cit.* (1909), pp.76-79, and *op. cit.* (1911), pp.187-8.
- 48) *Ibid.*, p.208. A significant change and strengthening in Chavasse's view had occurred. In preliminary discussion in 1909 'After much deliberation and many misgivings' he spoke in support of the permissive use of a white vestment: *op. cit.* (1909), p.75. In 1911 he warned that 'if that white vestment . . . were to be regarded as symbolical' of unreformed doctrine he would withdraw his support: *op. cit.* (1911), p.187.
- 49) E.A. Knox, *op. cit.*, p.311.
- 50) Harford and MacDonald in their major biography of Moule published two years after his death do not mention this incident; but historians of the Cambridge Inter-Collegiate Christian Union—J.C. Pollock, *A Cambridge Movement* (1953), pp.148-9; O.R. Barclay, *Whatever happened to the Jesus Lane lot?* (1977), p.55—and Dr. Loane in his short biography, each refer to the fact that Moule's episcopate fell short of the high goal his friends had conceived. 'The qualities of character that had made him great at Cambridge did not equip him for greatness as a Bishop.' (M.L. Loane, *Makers of our heritage*, (1967). p.87).
- 51) *Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) House of Lords*, CCLX, no.98 (Monday 13 July 1964), col.51.
- 52) Quoted at: Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society, *Evangelical Missions* (n.d.), p.5.
- 53) G. Hewitt, *The Problems of Success: A History of the Church Missionary Society 1910-1942*, I (1971), p.442; for the controversy generally see pages 461-473.
- 54) Hewitt, *op. cit.*, I, p.463.
- 55) E.A. Knox, *op. cit.*, p.329.
- 56) Minute book of the Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen, p.5.
- 57) Hewitt, *op. cit.*, I, 464.
- 58) W.S. Hooton & J.S. Wright, *The First Twenty-Five Years of the Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society (1922-1947)* (1947), p.5.
- 59) *Ibid.*, p.6; cf. Hewitt, *op. cit.*, I, p.465.
- 60) G.W. Bromiley, *Daniel Henry Charles Bartlett* (1959), p.24; cf. Hewitt, *op.cit.*, I, p.465.
- 61) Bromiley, *op. cit.*, p.25.
- 62) *Evangelical Missions*, p. 10.
- 63) *Ibid.*, pp.12-13.
- 64) Bishop W.W. Cassels wrote: 'The way in which modern views of the Bible are creeping into China is terrible. To me if our Lord is wrong as to His view of the Old Testament, I cannot be sure that He is not wrong in all His statements as to my redemption and the future life.' M. Broomhall, *W.W. Cassels* (1926), p.329.
- 65) The text of the March motion is at Hewitt, *op. cit.*, I, p.467.

- 66) Hooton & Wright, *op. cit.*, p.7.
- 67) *Ibid.*, p.9.
- 68) Minute book of the Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen, p.98.
- 69) Hooton & Wright, *op. cit.*, p.13; cf. Hewitt, *op. cit.*, p.470.
- 70) *Ibid.*, p.13; cf. Hewitt, *op. cit.*, I, pp.470-1.
- 71) P. Crowe (Ed.), *Keele '67* (1967). p.18.
- 72) J.I. Packer, *The Theological Challenge to Evangelicalism Today* (1961; Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen).
- 73) P. Crowe, *op. cit.*, p.37.
- 74) J.B. Lancelot, *Francis James Chavasse* (1929), p.6
- 75) P. Crowe, *op. cit.*, p.18.
- 76) *Ibid.*, p.22 (para. 16), p.26 (para. 37); cf. p.37 (para.82), p.39 (para. 92).
- 77) *Ibid.*, p.33 (para. 65).
- 78) *Ibid.*, p.37 (para. 84).
- 79) *Ibid.*, p.38 (para. 87).
- 80) *Richard II*, II, I, 252-5.
- 81) E.A. Knox; cf. n. 39.
- 82) Cf. n. 38