

## THE OLD BELIEVER 6

### EDITORIAL

*Annus horribilis*

Our bluff has been called! We vowed that if our Church were to abandon the Apostolic Ministry as all orthodox churches had received it, then we would abandon the resultant sect, while retaining Anglican faith and worship. That is, we would be A CONTINUING CHURCH.

Bluff - but surely we meant it! May God now have mercy upon us and give us the grace, courage and strength to do what is right and to keep the faith at whatever cost, and to reform our Church according to His most holy will.

The Church of England has survived apparent destruction before. During the Commonwealth period in the mid-seventeenth century there was no King (temporal Governor of the Church), no Archbishop of Canterbury and no Book of Common Prayer (its use was illegal). Churches were under the control of presbyterian or other ministers and our distinctive rites and ceremonies - even Christmass - abolished. How then did the Church of England survive? The answer is clear, there was a Continuing Church. Some of it was in a rather comfortable continental exile, some of it struggled on in secret here in England. Some defied the law and risked imprisonment by using the Prayer Book, others, such as Jeremy Taylor, framed their own liturgies, based on ancient (if sometimes exotic) texts. Some surviving Bishops performed clandestine ordinations. Thus was perpetuated a valid Eucharist and the other Catholic sacraments. It was a glorious period in Anglican history. One could be forgiven for thinking that the Church of England was better in "opposition" than in "government". So don't tell me that Continuing Churches only end in tears, that their fate is to splinter into tiny opposing groups and to die out. This is not what history tells us. Continuing Anglicanism then saved the Church of England until now - a period of over three hundred years of often most vigorous spiritual life.

The significant difference between Cromwell and Carey is that the former persecuted from without, the latter betrays from within. No church can survive the latter fate if a sufficient number follow the path of betrayal. We cannot wait for better times, as they did under Cromwell, for who can restore the faith to us if the *bishops* have abandoned it?

Our bluff, if it was a bluff, has been called. *Continuing Anglicanism is down to us*. So now I turn to the faithful, for whom professions of 'Continuing' never were a bluff, not mere posturing but a solemn vow before God (blessed be He). To those faithful I say: Let us hear no more of the supposed failures of continuing churches or of the impossibility of having a traditional, recognisable Church of England without the Crown, the Archbishop of Canterbury, without possession of our ancient cathedrals, parish churches and college chapels. These are merely the furniture - maybe bestowed upon our Church by God's express will, but now no longer of significance. *The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away, Blessed be the Name of the Lord*. Anglican theology and worship do not depend on the Crown, Prime Minister, Canterbury or York. All such claims are utter nonsense for those who know history and trust God.

*Forward in Faith.*

In January we held a major nationwide meeting, as reported on page 10, which was packed to capacity. It was a splendid event with Bishops from America, Canada and England; but for many it was as confusing as starting to watch a 38 part serial at episode 17 without even "the story so far".

Many unfamiliar terms were thrown about: T.A.C., A.C.C.(OP.), the Affirmation of St Louis... How could this be Continuing Anglicanism, if lifelong Anglicans knew not these phrases? And who were all these Bishops?

The problem is that we are one of the last churches to pass through this "black hole". Others have preceded us and have emerged in a different guise, with a changed vocabulary which is a struggle to learn.

The first question which many participants asked privately was: were we "Forward in Faith" and if not, in what respects were we different? The answer to the first question is "No"; to the second, we do not wholly know. From my personal perception of "Forward in Faith", it is not clear what they want to achieve - Rome or Continuing Anglicanism. This coalition of some fourteen Anglo-Catholic societies, together with sympathetic Evangelicals, is talking about *exploring all possibilities and considering every option*. We in M.C.C.E. are much clearer about what we want.

It is curious that those who have spent their lives in the Church of England, and many years contemplating the present situation, should be in such confusion about where their spiritual home might be, whom to trust, what to believe and why. Surely we in M.C.C.E. are more confident in our loyalties, not merely searching for the "best deal". We know what we want, even if we are not sure how best to achieve it

We have always recognised the Continuing Churches elsewhere in the world as the true Anglican churches in their lands, while supposing that the "official" Anglican bodies there were at best doubtful, at worst null and void. We resolved, years ago, that should our Church follow the path of those official bodies, we would follow the path of the Continuers. We have not faltered. As far as I know, "Forward in Faith" has made no such undertaking; nor have they, at the less critical level, repudiated the novelty of women deacons, which we have never recognised.

Nevertheless, we do not have all the answers, we may, for all we know, join with them in a Continuing Church, and they deserve any support we can spare.

#### *New Bishops for Old*

When the Bishops either applaud the new order or prefer establishment and the company of colleagues to the Wilderness, then other shepherds must be found. Their names will not be familiar. Many at the January meeting were surprised to learn of Bishop Leslie Hamlett, who already has a Continuing Church here. This is partly the fault of the national media, who give him not so much as a "sound bite". But he is here. Why then did we not simply say "*Please be our Bishop*"? Some answers emerge elsewhere in the journal. But here are some key points.

- He is a true bishop and we do not doubt his Orders.
- Our unease arises from the exclusive claim made that he alone has Continuing authority here.

## THE OLD BELIEVER 6

- We hope to be in full communion with him - but also with other Bishops, particularly Bishop Mercer, to stress continuity with our Church of England past
- We do not wish, whatever others say of us, merely to purge the old Anglican mishmash of priestesses and modern rites. No-one could read this journal and suppose that we did not intend to **recall Anglicans to their full traditional orthodox faith and order.**

End of page 1

We are not all-inclusive: but we are not exclusive either. If loyal Anglicans of whatever background can read this with benefit, and desire part and fellowship with us, we have an obligation to extend to them the "right hand of fellowship" in Christ. If they desire to be orthodox, should we not respect them, even when our interpretations of orthodoxy do not coincide? The new-style Anglicanism does not even intend to be orthodox; surely we can welcome those who do have this intention.

*Wider still and wider*

This is a larger, more 'inclusive' edition, since this is a critical time. We desperately need more funds. You have been generous - some gifts must have been costly - but this project is a bottomless pit! The more money, the more copies are printed and sent. We started with a circulation of sixty, but "Old Believer" 5 reached nearly five hundred people.

We need you to spread the word. Reading the "Old Believer" is not a secret vice!

We have every reason to encourage others to read it. Please photocopy it, persuade your friends to read it, leave copies in churches and generally get people interested. We will need to draw together in each locality. We must get to know one another. Please let me know if you DO NOT want your name to be released to others in your area.

I am a research student of theology, and so I probably have more spare time than many people. Therefore I am ready and willing to travel anywhere in the country to talk with any group, however small, to encourage, to answer questions on the issues we have to resolve, or on those mysterious initials T.A.C., A.C.C.(O.P.) and so on. Of course I am not a "big name", but I am available, and I shall appear with extra copies of the "Old Believer" in my case!

In the midst of all this ecclesiastical muddle, let us not forget that this is the most sacred season of our life in Christ, the Holy Pascha, both Christ's and our Passover from Death to Resurrection. *Therefore let us keep the feast...*

### A BACKWARD GLANCE

*The Revd. Jeremy Hummerstone*

A few years ago Alan Bennett compared those who were rewriting the Prayer Book to apes taking a wristwatch to pieces. We have now seen the apes dismantling the Church of England. That at least is the most charitable way to see it: that the Synod (two thirds of it) **did not know what it was doing.** The Chairman, boldly throwing all weight on one side of the debate, told the assembly that God wanted women priests and that moreover he, Carey, was in favour. The Bishop of Guildford who introduced the motion used language in so twisty a way you would not trust him to tell you the time of the next bus: "*Tradition*", he said, "*requires it.*" Various evangelicals who used to think the Bible forbade the ordination of women now came forward to

say that they had been "*wrestling with Scripture*" and were now able to say that it was in favour after all. (Wrestling with Scripture used to mean coming to terms with something difficult; now it means wresting it into a shape, that suits our purposes.) Bishop David Jenkins took out an onion and cried for justice. Where justice. Scripture, Tradition, George Carey and God were united in favour, how otherwise could a good Christian respond but vote in support? Just as the Alternative Service Book brought new members flooding into the churches, the ordination of women to the priesthood will do it all over again. We are going to be so credible as a Church that we shall be in danger of running out of pagans to evangelise. But the real difficulty is not with pagans - it never was - but with the wrong sort of Christians.

What of the fuddy-duddies who do not believe a word of this; who persist in thinking that the faith is based on truth revealed by God, and cannot be rewritten every few years to fit the spirit of the age? This is what our leaders say to them: Please don't express anger or dismay; these are unhelpful emotions (Carey). We still love you, unlovable as you are. We don't want you to leave the Church of England. But you must understand that the Church has moved on, and your beliefs cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely. Your bishops will die out and not be replaced. There will be no colleges acceptable to your ordinands and ultimately no valid ordinations available to them. You are being offered beds in an old folk's home; no long-term future, of course, but loving care all the time you are still with us and not causing trouble. You are the spiritual equivalent of tobacco smokers. We are too caring to insist that you stop the anti-social habit at your age, but you mustn't do it near other people.

End of page 2

### ORTHODOXY AND THE CONTINUUM

*Joseph P Farrell, D. Phil. (Oxon.)*

It may seem unusual for a traditionalist Orthodox Christian to write an article for a traditionalist Anglican journal. Unusual, because Anglicanism claims to be a branch of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church by virtue of its possession of the historic episcopate, priestly ministry and celebration of catholic sacraments, and unusual because the Eastern Church, on the contrary, unequivocally maintains that the Holy Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church is *not a branch, but the whole tree, roots, trunk, limbs, branches, twigs and leaves*, by virtue of its preservation without amendment, alteration or suppression of the Faith of the Undivided Church, expressed in its liturgies, the unaltered Nicene Creed, and the seven Ecumenical Councils. For the Orthodox Church the West, beginning with Rome, is in schism and heresy.

Nevertheless, while I do wholeheartedly accept, as an Orthodox Christian, these ecclesiological and dogmatic positions, I also bear a fondness for Anglican Christianity. Like many, I came to a love for sacramental and liturgical worship and a basically catholic world view as an Anglican. And like many who discover the dogmatic writings of the Church Fathers, my love and study of Patristics began with the Eerdmans translations of the Church Fathers that were largely inspired by Anglicanism and the Oxford Movement, a series that still remains indispensable for Patristic study. I have an

## THE OLD BELIEVER 6

affection for Anglicanism, therefore, that runs very deep, for in many ways Anglicanism brought me to Orthodoxy.

But there are deeper theological reasons for an article such as this, for there are parallels within the Anglican and Orthodox experience in this century, particularly in North America and Western Europe. Briefly put, both Anglicanism and Orthodoxy have been struggling to preserve their respective integral doctrinal, ministerial and liturgical traditions in the face of hierarchs who seem at best indifferent to or ignorant of them, and at worst deliberately out to destroy them and change them into the cheap *Ersatz* of modernism. Of course this phenomenon is not confined merely to Anglicanism and Orthodoxy but has also profoundly affected the lives of other ecclesiastical bodies as well. Part of the reason may be assigned to the prevailing materialism and scepticism of the age, but this would not account for the vitality of Christian communities in the Third World, nor for the disturbing theological undercurrents evident in many areas of the Third World.

Father George William Rutler at the Denver Consecrations of the first four bishops of the Continuum diagnosed a much deeper cause. What we are experiencing, he warned, was part of a struggle between orthodoxy and modernism that was transforming and renewing all the churches of Christendom. The former Bishop of London, the Right Reverend Graham Leonard, was even less optimistic with his repeated warnings of a type of trans-confessional apostasy which would, he maintained, redraw the boundaries of orthodoxy and apostasy upon lines very different from the current denominational institutions.

These opinions found a remarkably similar echo in the writings of the Russian Orthodox Archimandrite Constantine (Russian Church Abroad):

*"...there appear two conflicting processes which cannot but develop more and more clearly in the process of the unfolding of apostasy: on the one hand, the appearance within all Christian denominations of a certain kernel of "faithful" who are prepared to endure all in their faithfulness to their denomination in its original form...and at the same time the appearance, completely natural, with the drawing together in the name of faithfulness to Christ, of a sympathetic interest in the content of the faith of all the denominations thus drawn together."*

At first glance, the approach of these three men, each of unimpeachable orthodoxy at the time they made their remarks, may seem to be but a restatement of Saint Augustine of Hippo's formulation of the church in the "City of God", where he distinguished between the visible Church on earth, composed both of holy and unholy members, and the invisible heavenly Church, all of whose members were holy, but whose members were known only to God in the inscrutability of His divine election.

Closer analysis reveals this is not the mere restatement of Augustine, however. Saint Augustine's focus is largely moral. The new situation described by these three clerics is something entirely different. Augustine's "true" and "false" church were formulated in part on the basis of his theory of predestination: the true Church was invisible and known only to God. The true Church existed inside of the visible, corrupt Church on earth.

The new situation, while confusing, is different precisely because the focus is on the "visible" Church entirely. It is visible and discernible because its focus is not the invisible human heart nor the unknown and inscrutable divine election of Augustine's theory, but the doctrinal truth and traditions of a particular ecclesiastical body and the degree to which that body adheres to its own traditions.

What distinguishes the Church from this "anti-Church", regardless of the denomination in question, is thus not morality but whether or not the individual in view accepts the very idea of religious or dogmatic truth at all. An orthodox Presbyterian, for example, would have far more in common with an orthodox Roman Catholic, in spite of their very real differences, simply because both would recognise this principle of truth, and, by virtue of it, be *capable* of genuine disagreement.

The anti-Church, rejecting this principle, views doctrinal, liturgical, conciliar and confessional formularies, no matter how ancient or venerable, as *adiaphora*, subject to revision or rejection as the situation demands. Consequently, since truth is no longer the issue, it is *incapable* of *genuine* differences of doctrine; it sees only differences of emphasis and formulation.

At this point a variety of subtle tactics may be employed to suppress or to paper over such differences, all variations on the ancient Gnostic practice of pseudomorphosis, of borrowing familiar Christian terms and coupling entirely new meanings to them.

end of Page 3

These variations may take the form of inventing new terms altogether, of detaching the meaning of a term from the term and ascribing meaning to "what was really intended", and even the simple expedients of failing to define key terms at all or quietly dropping such formularies as cannot be dealt with in any other fashion.

The documents of the Consultation on Church Union (COCU) very effectively illustrate all these tactics and assumptions of the anti-church at work. The various ministries of participating member denominations are to be integrated into a threefold ministry which will be called that of "bishop, presbyter and deacon" simply because most denominations have offices which correspond *administratively* to the functions of these orders. But COCU is quick to point out that the ancient church allegedly exercised many different types of ministry, and that the warrant of Scripture cannot be exclusively claimed for any of them. Thus, confessional statements of the various member churches on ministry and polity are to be subordinated to the COCU scheme itself and the terms "bishop, presbyter and deacon" interpreted in accordance with the scheme itself, and not in accordance with the original confessional positions. As a consequence of its abandonment of revealed truth, the anti-church movement contains within itself an imperative towards a merely *institutional* union, since genuine unity in truth, worship, ministry and life is rejected. Thus, any union achieved by the anti-church can only rest on the flimsy foundations of mere externals, in homogenised ritualism and a "consensus of expression".

The process of this liturgical and ecclesiological homogenisation will be familiar to most Continuing

## THE OLD BELIEVER 6

Anglicans, so there is no need to recount it here. But it may be summarised by stating that radicals in position of authority will attempt to coerce debate by proceeding with an action or agenda that is contrary to the doctrinal tradition of a given church, as was the case of the Episcopal bishops who "ordained" the in famous Philadelphia Eleven: first establish the precedent, then make it law.

In this situation, some orthodox Anglicans see in Eastern Orthodoxy what other orthodox Anglicans see in Rome: a bedrock of stability, orthodoxy, a confidence in its institutions and a willingness to perpetuate and strengthen them. They have accordingly been attracted to both bodies, particularly in north America.

But sadly it must be clearly and frankly stated that Orthodoxy, particularly in North America, is in a state of grave spiritual, doctrinal and liturgical sickness. Each of the assumptions and tactics previously mentioned have become the *modus vivendi* of the upper echelons of most Orthodox jurisdictions in North America, and have fuelled "Continuing Orthodox" jurisdictions both in Europe and America. The Anglican considering joining the Orthodox Church must therefore make his decision based upon a prayerful appraisal of the truth of Orthodoxy on the one hand, and on the other hand on a mature consideration of the actual realities of Orthodoxy's current practice and jurisdictional fragmentation. He must train himself to be aware of the form that the tactics and assumptions of what I have called the "anti-church" will take in the Eastern Church. Some of these I will now attempt to survey.

### *One*

Orthodoxy presents a facade of doctrinal and liturgical unity that evaporates on close inspection. In North America, there are no less than five major jurisdictions with any claim to "canonical" status, and a bewildering array of micro-jurisdictions, usually, with two significant exceptions, of a questionably "traditional" character. This in and of itself should indicate that something is seriously wrong within Orthodoxy. While even a survey of these various jurisdictions would be too lengthy to recount here, it is useful to distinguish broadly between the two types, **modernist** and **traditionalist**.

Modernist jurisdictions may be easily discerned by their involvement in the official organs of the ecumenical movement, by their abandonment of the unrevised Julian calendar in favour of the Revised Julian calendar, by a tendency to liturgical experimentation and confusion, by a more or less uniform abandonment of biblical and liturgical English, by the teaching of the liberal forms of higher Biblical criticism in their seminaries, and by the exercise of sheer brute force on the part of some hierarchs to coerce changes in the canonical traditions of the Orthodox Church. The three best-known jurisdictions in North America are the Syrian Antiochian Archdiocese (Metropolitan Philip Saliba, Primate), the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America (Archbishop Iakovos) and the Orthodox Church in America (Metropolitan Theodosius). Mention must also be made of the parishes in North America still under the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate.

To a certain extent, these jurisdictions all share a common history, and to that extent, common problems. At the turn of the century, when North America was a more or less united jurisdiction under the Russian

Church, Greek and Arab parishes were served for the most part by clergy of their own ethnic background. In one instance, the Russian Church petitioned Antioch for an Arab bishop to minister to the Arabic speaking Orthodox churches. In the wake of the Russian Revolution, however, jurisdictional and canonical unity fragmented into the component ethnic groups, as each sought out its mother church in Europe and formed its own jurisdiction in lieu of the moral and theological implications of remaining in communion with Moscow, whose theological and ecclesiological position in the aftermath of the Revolution was confusing if not precarious.

Lacking unified episcopal direction, the orthodox Churches in America each began in their own different way, to come to grips with maintaining the Orthodox identity in America on the one hand, and the task of evangelism within a very different culture on the other. America became by default the testing ground on which Orthodox scholars and theologians educated largely in France could test new approaches to ecclesiology, liturgy and theology in the ecumenical context of the United States. In this atmosphere, a variety of small concessions such as pews, clerical suits, less stylised iconography and of course the New Calendar, was tolerated.

Much more serious, however, was the emerging development within each of these jurisdictions of its own peculiar vision of dealing with more fundamental issues.

end of Page 4

For example, the parishes of the Greek Archdiocese often continue to use Greek in their services, while at the official level the bishops espouse the use of Modern English in services, while some Greek scholars rightly protest that the English of the King James version is far better equipped to the task of dealing with the subtleties of the Greek. The Antiochian Archdiocese, on the other hand, has recently published a *Liturgikon* (similar to an altar missal) which uses liturgical English throughout. The Orthodox Church in America seems unable to make up its mind, and practice varies greatly from parish to parish and diocese to diocese.

The issue of the form of English is not a trifling one, nor simply a matter of mere aesthetics. At one level, it reflects the inability of these jurisdictions to come to terms with the clear indications of Orthodox tradition: that where there exists a form of the language specifically associated with religious and philosophical expression, that form of the language should be used; the vernacular is one thing, the colloquial and mundane is quite another.

By adopting this form of English, these individuals and jurisdictions have chosen the opposite tack to that of the King James translators and the Book of Common Prayer. Rather than trying to force the English to bear biblical and Orthodox concepts, reverence and mystery, they have opted for the tried and failed expedient of the "easily understood", when neither the Bible nor Orthodox theology are about things "easily understood". These jurisdictions have compounded the picture in another deep and fundamental way, for they have each sanctioned the use of the Revised Standard Version of the Holy Scriptures. For the Orthodox, as for the Anglicans, this is no small matter, for it means nothing less than the fact that these jurisdictions have abandoned

## THE OLD BELIEVER 6

the *only* version of the Scriptures in the English language - the King James - which preserves a New Testament text substantially that of the ecclesiastical text of the Orthodox Church, for a version whose underlying Greek text is the mutilated, threadbare and seductive textual clothing of the latest critical fashions.

While the issues here are numerous and too complex to consider in detail, the consequences of this step alone will be far-reaching, for the Holy Gospels are not only read at every Orthodox service, but *venerated* as well. Such a step implies spiritual and doctrinal consequences that bode ill for the health of Orthodoxy in the future.

Of the **traditionalist** jurisdictions there are primarily two, the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia, variously known as the Russian Synod, or the Synod Abroad, and the Greek Old Calendarists. Both jurisdictions reject outright any involvement with the ecumenical movement, reject the New Calendar, and tend to favour both the traditional liturgical English and the King James Bible in their English language parishes. Neither jurisdiction was formed in reaction to currents in North America, but were transplanted from Europe, where they were constituted in part in reaction to deviations from what they understood to be canonical norms. Like all traditionalist resistance movements, however, they have attracted extremist elements.

These extremist elements usually manifest themselves in some sort of extreme reaction to "the West". In one case, some attempted even to deny the status of Saint Augustine of Hippo as a Church Father simply because many of the peculiarly western deviations from Orthodoxy stem from his theological writings. Unfortunately, these types of extremist groups end in the same revisionism they attempt to deny, for Saint Augustine's name is clearly enumerated as a father of the Church by the Fifth Ecumenical Council, and thus his status as a father of the Church can only be denied by an assertion that the Fifth Ecumenical Council did not really know what it was talking about! While it is true that Saint Augustine has never approached the stature in the East that he has in the West, it is nevertheless a fact that he is a saint of the Orthodox Church, read for instruction in piety, but not for instruction in theology, a position remarkably similar to the position he held in some portions of the West prior to his elevation to the status of the quintessential Father in the Carolingian period.

### *Holy*

We saw that a favourite tactic of an individual committed to an agenda of "reform" is to establish his agenda through a precedent dependent for its validity on the exercise of brute authority. The Antiochian Archdiocese affords perhaps the best, though not the only example to appreciate the application of this strategem in Orthodoxy. By Orthodox canon law, a priest may be married if he marries before ordination. If his wife should die before he does, he is to remain a widower the rest of his life, and may not remarry. These strictures may seem odd or even erroneous to an Anglican, but it is important to see behind them to the principle involved in unsettling these norms.

Recently Metropolitan Philip (Saliba) of the Antiochian Archdiocese allowed a priest to remarry after his wife had died after a tragic illness. This produced a furore throughout not only the Antiochian Archdiocese but

other Orthodox jurisdictions as well, both Modernist and Traditionalist. There was no canonical justification forthcoming, but only the insistence by Metropolitan Philip that he had the authority to do so, and that everyone must accept his decision. This unfortunate incident is not an isolated example, however, of erratic behaviour, for a few short years previous to this Metropolitan Philip had received *en masse* the so-called "Evangelical Orthodox Church", a group of former Protestants who had read themselves into Orthodoxy. While the motivations for their reception were laudable, the manner and timing of it were at best questionable. Orthodox tradition is to ordain only one person to any rank of clergy in any given church on any given day. Again, Metropolitan Philip, on the basis of very dubious precedent, decided unilaterally to set aside tradition and proceed with ordinations of Evangelical Orthodox clergy *en masse*. While these may seem trifling matters, they loom much more ominously when one considers the fact that within Orthodoxy there is a disturbing trend among a few theologians who wish for the Church to rethink her understanding of the role of women in the Church; with the presence of bishops willing on their own authority to flout received tradition and canonical norms, the situation is much more ominous than first meets the eye.

*To be concluded in the next Old Believer*  
end of Page 5

### **Sermon delivered at St. Clement, Cambridge at the Patronal Festival**

Rev. Ian G Page

*"Therefore, my brethren, dearly beloved and longed for, my joy and crown, so stand fast in the Lord."*

It says much about human history, that, throughout history, many of the kings and governors who most savagely persecuted the Church were among the best rulers that their respective nations had - best, that is, in worldly terms. Take the Roman empire for instance. Lazy and lackadaisical emperors did not particularly care about the new cult from the Near East that was making such inroads into the populus. For the conscientious Emperors, however, men such as Trajan - in whose reign St. Clement was martyred - Christianity was a matter of grave concern. These men could see the divisiveness of this new religious force as it turned citizens away from the gods of their fathers in town after town and household after household.

The persecutors of the church, from Pontius Pilate down to the police officers who brutalise and intimidate pro-Life demonstrators in the united States today, have never been, you may be surprised to hear, lacking in virtue. In them virtues such as civic duty and zeal to defend freedom of choice have run riot, and, like cells turned cancerous, have become the vehicles of evil and of death. As it was in the ancient world, so it is today. In describing the modern world, G.K. Chesterton has said: *"The vices are, indeed, let loose and they do damage. But the virtues are let loose also, and the virtues do more terrible damage. The modern world is full of the old Christian virtues gone mad. The virtues have gone mad because they have been isolated from each other and are wandering alone."*

So it was that concern for the poor and the oppressed led to the yoke of communism. So it was that a rampant and debased patriotism led to the construction of the gas

## THE OLD BELIEVER 6

chambers. Mercifully the threats of Nazi and Communist tyranny have passed into history, yet, just as our liberty seems assured, we are assaulted by another 'virtue-gone-mad', one which for at least thirty years has been sweeping away Christian behaviour, overturning Christian morality, marginalising Christian thought, and which now stands poised to sweep away the very fabric of Faith, that is to say, Christian doctrine and our sacramental lives together in Christ. The 'virtue-gone-mad' to which I refer is Liberty itself. She is the idol of modern, western man.

Our attitude towards the Faith must rest firmly upon two principles:

- that Christianity is a revealed religion. No religious leader, no committee or council made up the Faith. It was revealed once and for all by God. For, as St. Paul says of the Faith: *"I did not receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came through a revelation of Jesus Christ."*
- that Christianity is a Saving Faith. And not only a saving faith, but as far as we know, the only saving faith.

Of His loving mercy the Almighty has revealed this Faith to us. Christ our God dies upon the cross for us so that we may at the last be reconciled with and united to God, so that we may be made partakers of the Kingdom. That is why we are bound by the Faith. That is why we must cling to it so tightly, because so much more than our lives depends upon it. It comes from God, and God knows best. It comes from Him at dreadful cost. And it comes for our salvation, and for our everlasting joy.

The demon "Liberty-gone-mad" cuts across all this. Our Churches are full of people who have been led to believe that it is not necessary to believe in our Lord's virginal conception or that it is not necessary to believe that there was an empty tomb on Easter Day. Amongst the clergy we find hirelings; bogus Catholics who seek to 'affirm' carnal relationships that the Church has always known to be sin. In more ways than one it is true that they follow a hollow way. "Liberty-gone-mad" is not only wrong, she is also false. The truth of the virginal conception and the Empty Tomb remains true whether we believe it or not. Sin remains sin, virtue remains virtue. We have neither the right nor the ability to change that which God has revealed to us through the Christian Tradition.

For example, St. Clement of Rome, whom we honour today, wrote an Epistle. And very fine it is too. Now in theory, the Church of England could call a synod and could vote to add St. Clement's Epistle to the Canon of Scripture. But I ask you, if this were done, would the new book, containing all our Holy Writ plus St. Clement's Epistle, be the Bible? The answer is no! Even if some people insisted on calling it the Bible, it would not be that which we have always known the Bible to be. The Bible has a givenness about it which we cannot change. And so has the priesthood. The recent general synod vote on the ordination of women to the priesthood has all the authority of a vote to abolish the law of gravity or a resolution which declares the moon to be made of green cheese. It has no more to do with woman's worthiness for the office than the exclusion of St. Clement's epistle from the Bible has to do with its merits. It has everything to do with Tradition; to do with the sacred 'givenness' of the things of God. One of the most shameful aspects of the recent synodical farce was

the insistence of some of the innovators that tradition required the ordination of women.

We must ask: what is the evidence? Where do we find this in the Church Fathers? Where do we find this in Hooker or the later Anglican Divines? Where do we find evidence for this in the Roman, Byzantine or Oriental communions? Where are the ancient Christian liturgies that cry out for priestesses? That the innovators could say that Tradition requires the ordination of women could be interpreted as an indication of the depth of their folly. On the other hand, it may simply be a lie. At the end of the day, that is between them and their Creator.

Christians are called upon to enjoy the 'glorious liberty of the children of God'. But the liberty of a child consists precisely in the trust and obedience that is the parent's due. It is not the freedom to run away from home or to bum the house down.

end of Page 6

Yet this is precisely the liberty that the Church of England has taken, and soon the matches will be lit. "Liberty-gone-mad" has hijacked our Church and has led her into the most deadly sin of all, hybris or pride: the smug belief that the devices and desires of her own heart are better than the Way that the Lord has set before her.

If we are to be faithful, we must shun her apostasy. We must have no part in it. That is to say: it is no good thinking "Oh, it's all very terrible but we'll never have it here". That is the attitude of a congregationalist, not a Catholic Christian. We must have no part in the apostate body. No part in an organisation at enmity with God. That means not being in communion with bishops who purport to ordain women to the priesthood.

And furthermore, not remaining in communion with any member of the Church of England's bench of bishops. Even if a bishop is opposed to the innovation himself. Even if he refuses to do it himself.

For he partakes of the treason of those false shepherds who so betray the Lord, if he remains in communion with them. What fellowship could Peter or John have had with Iscariot? We must place our hope in the Lord. If our bishops fail. He will provide others.

*O God, who makest us glad with the yearly solemnity of blessed Clement, Thy Martyr and Bishop: mercifully grant that as we now celebrate his birthday, so we may imitate his constancy in suffering.*

### **ECCLESIA Guidelines: A Call to Catholics in the Church of England**

In the midst of the present sadness and turmoil, it is necessary to consider how we should behave in the period before our enforced departure from the Church of England. Our motto must now be: **COMMUNION BUT NOT FELLOWSHIP**. As Catholics, we can remain in communion with the Church of England until we are obliged to leave by its formal apostasy when the priestess canon is promulgated. But we cannot remain in fellowship with those who have supported and connived at the destruction of the Church of England as part of Catholic Christendom. They have shown themselves to be the enemies of Christ's truth. We therefore urge that the following guidelines be now followed:

1. **No services, meetings or gatherings should be attended at which there is a danger of mixing with those in favour of priestesses.** Any such contact will serve only to encourage the pro-priestess campaigners to imagine that the situation can

## THE OLD BELIEVER 6

eventually be 'normalised'. It will also give them the opportunity to indulge in their favourite present pastime - "sharing" our pain.

2. **Priests should avoid contact with, and ignore the directions of, pro-priestess bishops.** By their stance such bishops have betrayed their consecration oath to "banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's word". They have thus lost all moral authority to issue directives to their clergy. A priest's oath of canonical obedience to his bishop is made with respect to "all things lawful and honest". The creation of priestesses is against the Law of Christ and is contrary to Catholic Truth; it is therefore neither lawful nor honest.
3. **Parishes should cease to make quota payments to their dioceses.** Catholics should not give money to dioceses which are now preparing to fund priestesses in an apostate sect.
4. **Clergy and laypeople should resign from Church of England synods, committees and other official bodies which function at any other than parish level.** The continued presence of Catholics on these bodies can only give comfort to our enemies. In the time that remains no good can be done by remaining on diocesan synods, parsonage boards and the like. It will only be taken as collaboration.
5. **Catholic priests and laypeople must do everything in their power to sustain one another in this time of crisis.** Mutual support, prayer and fellowship must uphold us as we review the options available to us in our pilgrimage to remain members of the Catholic Church. Differences between 'modern' and 'traditional' Catholics have now paled into insignificance. Our loyalty to the Crucified Lord and His Catholic Truth must bind us together as never before. Attempts at intimidation by the pro-priestess bishops and clergy must be met by a strong, united and defiant Catholic faithful.

Assistant Editor's comment:

These are sensible suggestions for an emergency. Since the bench of bishops has determined to hang together, and that there will be no distinction of orders in the priestess church, they now all **by their deliberate choice** participate in the one error. One priestess, and all subsequent ordinations of men are invalid, not because of a 'taint' but because of a clearly expressed, carefully considered and jointly taken decision.

The distinction between 'communion' and 'fellowship' is artificial, for they are both renderings of the same New Testament word. By avoiding the bishops and their followers we have abandoned communion with them, except to the extent that we do not repel them from our worship. But the tactics are generally right. It is however sensible for those working for the Third Province (for example) to attend church bodies in order to emphasise that we will not be reconciled within the priestess body.

It is quite proper not to pay the quota. It is a moral, not a legal, obligation, and the moral relationship has ceased. This is true for all dioceses, since the bishops are hanging together and some money will go centrally to pay for training priestesses. However, parishes should repay to their dioceses any legal debts they have contracted.

No new covenants should be made in favour of the Church of England or related bodies such as USPG or

the Urban Fund. A sensible strategy is to make a covenant with the Charities Aid Foundation, 48 Pembury Road, Tonbridge, Kent TN9 2JD. Payments can then be made through CAF to any registered charity when you choose. This is obviously better than losing the Christian habit of giving.

end of Page 7

### **One, Catholic and Apostolic?**

*A comment by the Assistant Editor*

The Book of Common Prayer followed late medieval tradition in leaving out the "Holy" from the Creed of the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople which we all call the "Nicene" Creed. We might well agree with this humility. But the other adjectives are more important to our future and our obligations.

Those of us who have studied the early Church know that it settled down to a system of a Bishop for each town (and surrounding countryside), with some use of provincial and occasionally ecumenical councils for joint decision-taking; all parts of the Church were normally in communion with each other through their Bishops, so the Christian traveller would be welcomed by his brethren. There were no overlapping bishoprics; "altar against altar" was a shared horror in the controversy between Catholic and Donatist. But it would be anachronistic to speak of a single jurisdiction; relationships between Bishops were more charitable than legalistic.

A brief glance at contemporary England will show how remote from that system we are. Any part of England is (practically or notionally) under the jurisdiction of each of a Roman, Anglican, several different sorts of Orthodox, Oriental, Old Catholic and probably a few other Bishops, all with some legitimate claim to be Catholic and Apostolic, some also determined to claim to be One. Bishop Hamlett has recently joined the club. The Traditional Anglican Communion will probably do so, unless *Continuers in the Faith* is itself able to organise a direct succession when the present Church of England bishops cease to be Catholic. "Altar against altar" exists.

We do not accept the Roman pretensions to be the only pure form of the Church and so One. Nor do we accept the similar Orthodox pretensions (and which branch of them should, have our allegiance - see Dr. Farrell's paper elsewhere in this "Old Believer"?) Much less then are we likely to accept any other body's claims to be the One Church which we must join. As was argued against the Donatists, God has not confined His salvation to one corner of the world. Those who stress their single purity put at risk their claim to be Catholic, for that word means not "high" but universal.

A single Bishop for England and Wales is not the Early Church system of a Bishop in each town giving close episcopal oversight.

Whatever we do, no choice of ours will produce One Church, or materially increase the fragmentation which already exists. The most that might be in our power is to produce one successor to the Church of England. Even that is unlikely.

"I believe in One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church and sincerely regret that it does not exist." The quotation is attributed, I do not know how reliably, to Archbishop William Temple. His and our regret should be sincere. We have no choice but to participate in the existing

## THE OLD BELIEVER 6

fragmentation and we may for a time have no practical choice but to add to it, but it is an evil.

If we add to it, it is because we are committed to continuing all that was sound in Anglicanism, not to creating something new on a narrow basis. We seek wide relationships of communion with those who share that vision. We do so believing that Anglicanism, before recent distortions, was a proper following of Christ, free from some errors made by other parts of the Catholic Church, though of course with defects of its own. We appreciate the attempt to create structures which *preclude* error, but the result is contrary to the Anglican vision and hardly Catholic in the sense of the Creed.

That is why the TAC Bishops at our January meeting pleaded with us not to make unnecessary divisions and to be provisional in the structures we create. Our commitment

must be to recover practical unity (communion and some joint decision-taking) within a generation for all continuing Anglicans - preferably with as little interruption of that unity as possible on the way. This is not the same as a single jurisdiction - a mentality more of law than of early Church practice. We must avoid pretentious claims; let our Bishops have titles which reflect precisely those Christians who they are overseeing.

We have heard people under the oversight of Bishop Hamlett say: "The Continuing Church already exists; join it". We accept a duty to work for Christian unity; we deny that the unity of continuing Anglicans in England is the same thing. Of course it is desirable; but not at the price of an un-Catholic remit and the loss of communion with many other continuing bodies.

Bishop Hamlett was right and has been vindicated by events. He and his original congregation have witnessed to the truth and deserve our praise, thanks and prayers. May their missionary efforts prosper. We certainly wish to be in communion with them. But they do not have the right or sole Apostolic authority to determine our future course.

*Full text of the article by Paul Cavendish*

*The article on the next page has been abridged to fit the available space. The full text, with detailed references, is also available from Michael Mowbray Silver.*

end of Page 8

### ARCHBISHOP LEFEBVRE - AGAIN

*An abridged reply by Paul Cavendish*

In her article "Archbishop Lefebvre - an Appreciation" (Old Believer No. 5) Margaret Smythe states that "(Marcel Lefebvre) had courage to defend the Old Mass against the innovations of the Pope and Vatican Council." This erroneous remark must be exposed as fallacious as there are important principles at stake. What Lefebvre actually did was to try to defend a triumphalistic Ultramontane ecclesiology (which of course condemns Anglicans and others to hellfire unless they become Roman Catholics or are 'invincibly ignorant') and to cause considerable confusion, albeit perhaps unintentionally, amongst those who were instinctively unhappy with Paul VI's new Mass.

Firstly, if Roman Catholicism is true then there is no need for any bishop to defend anything against a Pope or a Council ratified by the Pope. As a former Roman Catholic Bishop, Lefebvre upheld as a requirement for salvation the dogmatic pronouncement of Vatican I,

**Pastor aeternus**, defining the infallibility and primacy of jurisdiction of the Pope. In Roman theology there is no room for disagreement - you have to obey the Pope. It would have been logical if Lefebvre had claimed that the Popes since Vatican II were anti-Popes, and so could be ignored, or if he had rejected the idea of papal primacy and jurisdiction. However, he took neither of these options and, by the rules he upheld, died outside the Roman Church. The whole subject of Roman Catholic teaching on the Papacy and Lefebvre's canonical position is dealt with admirably by J. S. Daly in his book "Michael Davies - an Evaluation (available from Briton's Catholic Library, PO Box 554, Pershore, Worcs., WR10 1BQ).

Secondly and more importantly, it is fallacious to identify Vatican II as the cause which produced Paul VI's new Mass. While it is understandable that many Roman Catholics fail to comprehend this fact, it is tragic that Anglicans also fall into the same trap, considering the level of scholarship of past Anglicans in matters liturgical.

The new Mass was basically constructed between 1948 and 1953. In 1948 Pius XII appointed a Pontifical Commission for General Liturgical Reform, which produced a draft plan for a radical overhaul. This led to the 'Restored' Paschal Vigil of 1951 (revised 1952) which already introduced many simplifying features. Most of the 1969 changes were recommended by a series of liturgical congresses 1951 -1953 directed by the Plan Commission (the recommendations are listed in Appendix A of "Bringing the Mass to the People", H.A. Reinhold, Bums Oates, 1960). Following further meetings with groups of liturgical experts came the legislation abolishing the ancient practice of fasting from midnight (see "Old Believer" Vol. 2) in 1953 and major 'simplifications' of the rubrics of the missal and breviary in 1955. These were interim measures to enable the old books to be kept in use until the reform was completed. Again in 1955 the decree **Maxima Redemptionis** 'reformed' the rest of the Holy Week services, mutilating the ancient liturgy and replacing it with a banal, sterile rite.

In 1956 the Plan Commission questioned all Metropolitans and Archbishops with regard to their views on the reform. Lefebvre was against the vernacular and the suppression of double feasts, but did favour reducing the cleric's obligation to recite the Divine Office. The significance of this consultation is that the most important bishops of the Roman Church, *including Lefebvre himself*, were well aware of what was being planned with regard to liturgical reform. The much put about idea that the bishops at Vatican II were 'hoodwinked' by a few 'modernists' is a whimsical fantasy.

In 1956 Pius XII gave approval for mass facing the people - the most obvious break with the past till then.

In 1960 a further decree, with an Apostolic Letter from John XXIII, again simplified the rubrics. Pope John wrote "we have reached the conclusion that the basic principles for a general liturgical restoration should be referred to the Fathers of the forthcoming Ecumenical Council, but that the correction of the rubrics of the Breviary and Missal should not be postponed any longer." The rubrics for the new Holy Week were extended throughout the year. Feasts of saints occurring

## THE OLD BELIEVER 6

on a Sunday were not to be observed. Commentators explained that the resultant 1962 missal was only an interim rite, pending the deliberations of Vatican II.

The structure of the 1969 missal can therefore be traced back twenty years before Vatican II. The idea that the new Mass was a 'misinterpretation' of Vatican II is utter nonsense. Vatican II merely gave the concept of liturgical reform a popular appeal.

Returning to Lefebvre, Margaret Smythe states that 'he cannot be fairly criticised for not being more traditional' and that he 'could not do what he liked about the reforms of Pius XII' and that if he had rejected them later he 'would have been failing as a Churchman when the one thing needful was the preservation of the Church's greatest treasure, the Mass of the Roman Rite'. Why should he not be criticised? The Society of St. Pius X originally *did* reject the Pius X reforms. The ancient Holy Week rites were performed again in England until 1983 when *Lefebvre himself* banned them, seemingly in order to make the 1962 missal a key item in negotiations with Rome. Some of his followers in the U.S.A. and Italy consequently left him; because of the integrity of these brave priests the ancient Holy Week liturgy is still celebrated, in spite of Lefebvre's attempt to suppress it. Ultimately, the reform of the Roman liturgy in the twentieth century is a result of the authoritarian exercise of Papal power. The 'Tridentine' missal itself was the imposition of a specific rite by the papacy on Churches which had hitherto been responsible for their own liturgy. On balance, that missal was probably a very good thing, but it set the precedent for Rome to impose its decrees on the vast majority of Western Catholics.

The irony of Lefebvre's position is that it desperately tries to uphold an ultramontane view of the papacy which is irreconcilable with Rome's expressed will on liturgical and other reform. If Lefebvre had been more Gallican in his approach, as his compatriots had a long history of being, and had concentrated on what was intrinsically right rather than tying himself in knots over papal authority, the quality of liturgy available to us today would be far more acceptable.

*Editor's comment: yes, but half a loaf...*

End of page 9

THE ORANGE STREET MEETING  
16 JANUARY 1993

*A report by the Assistant Editor*

Some 22 clergy and 150 laity attended, besides the speakers reported below. The meeting was opened by Fr. Whiting (Chairman, M.C.C.E.); prayers, which included the Litany of the Holy Ghost, were said.

This account attempts to summarise the speakers' main points and key issues raised in discussion.

**Revd. Ivan Crosby** of the Church of Ireland, Traditional Rite.

The Church of England is about to become apostate and will then cease to be the Anglican Church. It is vital for a Continuing Church to be set in motion now and for people to be informed of the existence of the Movement. There are thousands of Anglican Christians who do not wish to become Roman Catholics or to join any other branch of the Catholic Church, as defined in the Creeds. Certain facts should be made available to the Christian public. We must explain why Almighty God is masculine in His relationship to mankind; that the so-called ordination of women is not only wrong in itself,

but that certain devastating consequences will follow. There is a humanist agenda which includes such things as lay celebration, abandonment of the historic Creeds and the traditional interpretation of Scripture, the rewriting of the Liturgy and much else. Rome is under increasing pressure to conform to this secular image and it is not unlikely, at least in the U.S.A., that her Bishops will succumb.

Women will become surrogate men with all that that entails, and the nature and function of the Priesthood will be changed. The voices of the traditionalists who remain 'within\*' will not be heard.

Throughout Christendom the Church is being cleansed and this cleansing must take place before we can evangelise, contrary to the "decade of evangelism". Our Lord always

raises up some to continue in the faith once delivered, and no man has the right to raise his hand against the Lord's Anointed. We shall not be seceding; we are in the business of restoring the Anglican Church and bringing it back into the fold of mainstream Christianity.

*In discussion*, it is perfectly possible to be an Anglican Catholic and "the lowest of the low"; the Prayer Book is in use.

*A pamphlet version of his talk is available from the editor - stamped addressed envelope please.*

The problem of the claims made for Bishop Hamlett's jurisdiction was raised at this stage - see the separate article by the Assistant Editor. *For Bishop Hamlett's own case, large stamped addressed envelope to The Bishop's Office, Saint Mary's House, -Byatt's Grove, Longton, Stoke on Trent ST3 2RH.*

**Mrs. Margaret Brown**, member of General Synod.

The real downfall came with the making of women deacons. With the almost total loss of the Prayer Book has gone all sense of reverence. Christianity is now regarded as one of many equal world religions.

It is said that Bishops can still be Bishops in the Established Church even if they are opposed to the proposed legislation for priestesses, but how can this be? What will happen in practice? We have a recipe for chaos. So what are we going to do? We must stay put for the time being, until the Canon is promulgated. There is very little chance that it will not go through, but we must wait.

A group of people are working to bring about an autonomous Province, a Third Province for traditional Christians; one with its own Archbishop, its own canon law, and a fair share of the buildings and assets of the established Church of England. Traditionalists make up approximately one third of the established Church, so that is the share we seek. Many traditionalists are understandably frightened of being in the wilderness, but if there were a Third Province so constituted, many would join it.

*In discussion*: the new Province would not be in communion with Canterbury, and to that extent the title is one of convenience. The proposal, irrespective of its merits, does not help those who consider themselves already unchurched; for them, something immediate is needed - though this in no way denies the plausibility of this way forward, and they might well be happy to join the new body when available.

*For those who wish to support the idea of a Third Province, send a stamped addressed envelope to Mrs.*

## THE OLD BELIEVER 6

Margaret Brown, Third Province Movement, Luckhurst, Mayfield, East Sussex TN20 6TY.

**Michael Mowbray Silver**, Editor of the "Old Believer". The Church pre-existed in the mind of God, so we are stewards of the faith; we do not control it. Negatively, there is no other body we can join in confidence; positively, God has blessed Anglicanism for 400 years. Hence we must repudiate error and continue soundly.

This is a very brief summary; as orthodoxy does not reverse itself overnight, many of the leading ideas are to be found in the first "Old Believer". The full text is available from the speaker.

### **Dr. Paul Fauch.**

Launch of his Training Scheme - see the "Epiphany Fellowship" on Page 12 in this edition.

**The Bishops.** Archbishop Falk and Bishop Clavier (U.S.A.), Bishop Mercer (Canada) and Bishop Hamlett (A.C.C. Missionary Diocese for England and Wales) were present. They were asked for tactical suggestions on further resistance, but more important, for their own experience and advice. Their general judgement was that further struggle, such as appeals to Parliament or the Sovereign, was unlikely to achieve anything.

**Archbishop Falk.** Your solution must be your own. The odds are that you will fragment for a time, but don't make the way back together hard. Be provisional and do not erect grandiose structures. Communion rests on commonality of faith more than on structures. It is well understood that different groups and individuals will move at different speeds.

end of page 10

**Bishop Clavier.** Many American problems spring from divided aspirations and church politics, and from the feeling that some groups "jumped the gun". So don't follow us. Division in England will have even worse results than it did in the U.S.A., because of the "Establishment" background. Do establish communion with each other and make that unity stick. If you "stay in", remember that those who offer you that opportunity have so organised it so that you will die out Trust in God and the Holy Spirit to lead you where He will have you.

**Bishop Hamlett.** Unity is Jesus' will; but of what kind? It can only be based on truth. Since few will join us from the modern Church of England, growth will depend on our mission to unbelievers. But that requires us to be reconciled to each other. The A.C.C. exists - for we indeed "jumped the gun".

**Bishop Mercer.** Remember that the "conscience clause" has just been withdrawn in Canada. Do not be deceived by smoothness.

**Speakers from the floor** recognised and reflected the differing tendencies among those present. There was a case for fighting - but would success be any better than a badly resuscitated corpse? There was a case for making an immediate start - "where the Bishop is, there is the Church" rather than the careful and late selection of Bishops proposed for Continuers in the Faith. It was unfortunate that not all "continuing" tendencies were present (key members of "Forward in the Faith" had been invited but had had a clash of commitments). Some wanted a very clear faith and canons - not a vision which might turn to an ideology and end in error. One could rally round Bishop Hamlett simply because he was there. One could make a serious effort towards the

Orthodox, if we were happy to eliminate what they regarded as heresy. And so on.

In conclusion, Continuers in the Faith was set up - see the details on Page 17 - and the meeting closed with prayer. So we take another step - not with easy enthusiasm, but as part of a serious struggle to discern God's will for us.

end of page 11

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

*from Fr. Stafford, English Missal Society*

Had the Church of England decided to remain faithful to our Lord's Catholic truth on 11th November, we would have met at Saint Stephen's Parish Church, Hull, on the feast of King Charles the Martyr. Alas, as we all know, the Church of England has made clear its intention to abandon Catholic faith and order. Consequently, the English Missal Society ceased on the evening of 11th November.

I cannot help but remember that fateful day when King Charles was beheaded. What must have gone through his mind? To a less saintly man it must have seemed the end. No King, no priest to offer the Holy Sacrifice, no salvation for this dear country of ours. But to the saintly men or women who give themselves willingly unto death at the hands of wicked men for the sake of Christ, they share His death so that they may once again share His glorious resurrection.

Those who hold the Catholic faith within the Church of England have been sentenced. They now await their execution, which will take place on the date when the canon to ordain women to the priesthood becomes law. The Church of England will then have lost all claim upon her Catholic inheritance.

We die with Christ so that we may share His glorious resurrection. To look back on past events, or to continue as though nothing had happened by celebrating glorious Masses for our own delight rather than for the glory of God would surely be folly. No, we offer ourselves to Christ as we joyfully wait for our execution, knowing full well that everything the English Missal Society stood for will come to fruition in a most glorious resurrection, much more than we can now comprehend or imagine. Our death sets us free. In the mean time, please pray for the conversion of England, that we may all be eventually be united in our Lord's Catholic truth. May God bless you all.

From Revd. Paul Fauch. Epiphany Fellowship  
From 1861 until recently, the Church of England was served by the Order of Deaconesses. In 1888, the Wesleyan Methodists instituted "Wesley Deaconesses". But recently, these became lady "Ministers" and the General Synod followed suit. Deaconesses were to be Deacons, and the order of Deaconess abolished.

A Continuing Church ought to revive the Order of Deaconess, as being of ancient origin and practice - see the Article in the Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. In forty years of ministry, every parish where I have served would have benefited from the services of a Deaconess, although I have enjoyed the collegueship of several lady parishioners who virtually did the work of a Deaconess without the title and honour attached thereto. One was a churchwarden, one an organist, one enrolling member of the Mothers' Union, and one Secretary of the PCC.

## THE OLD BELIEVER 6

I would welcome some correspondence on the subject - and let us keep our eyes open for likely candidates. Forty years ago, there were also "licensed Lady Workers" and Church Army sisters, besides Anglican nuns. They all wore uniform, and gave sterling service, without having any "liturgical function" in church; though I have seen them occupy seats in the chancel.

*Comment from the Editors. Old Believer 4 included a report of a new Deaconess in the Australian Continuing Church. Surely we would be happy to do likewise; there is a wide range of ministries in the Church either open to women or proper to them. What perhaps needs more thought is the role of Lay Readers, because these traditionally have a liturgical function. We can hardly have different duties for male and female under the same title. What should we do - especially if there is a shortage of priests (whether paid or not) and a scattering of small groups wanting to worship together somehow?*

### THE EPIPHANY FELLOWSHIP

The Epiphany Fellowship is a training scheme for men and women who would volunteer for service in the Continuing Church. The scheme is also available for potential candidates for a revived Order of Deaconesses - see Letters to the Editor. To begin with, there will need and scope for many Lay Readers. In due course, some of the men may well proceed to Ordination, but, in any case, here is a ready-made scheme of training without going to a residential college.

A correspondence course is offered, with twenty four essay subjects on Biblical Studies, and twelve on Church History, to be done by August 1993. The Creed, Prayer Book and liturgical history will be introduced in the Autumn. A second year of study will, it is hoped, cover the same ground, dotting "I"s and crossing "T"s.

A number of "events" has been arranged (mostly in London) to which members of the Fellowship are earnestly invited.

There are no fees for tuition, but candidates are asked to enclose a stamped addressed envelope with all letters to the Revd. Paul Fauch, 26 West Street, London WC2H 9NA.

end of Page 12

### AN OPEN LETTER

#### To Father Michael Wright and the Anglican Catholic Church (Original Province) Missionary Diocese of England and Wales

Dear Father, Thank you for the letters you sent to me on January 20th and February 20th, and especially for the copy of Bishop Leslie Hamlett's newsletter "A Way Forward". Having read and re-read this material, I can only say that your perspective, and that of the Anglican Catholic Church (OP) continues to fill me with the deepest sadness.

I hope and pray for the unity of the still small and fragile Continuing Church movement around the world. Yet I know that if I submit to Bishop Hamlett's oversight for the sake of unity here in England, I thereby support and perpetuate the divisive excommunication policy of those American bishops who consecrated him - and that I cannot believe Christ would have us do.

*Needlessly divisive*

The simple fact is that ACC(OP) requires its adherents to be out of communion with the clear majority of continuing Anglicans around the world, despite the fact

that there is **no essential point of Faith, Order or Morals in dispute between them**. This policy is needlessly divisive, if not suicidal, and I can in no way condone it or contribute to it.

I have every reason to believe that Bishop Hamlett is a devout and courageous man. However, as you know, he was "elected" not by consultation with English Continuers generally, nor by their organisations and representatives, but mostly by his own Stoke parishioners, then consecrated in the USA by one of the warring factions there, despite earnest pleas to desist from English traditionalists in M.C.C.E. and Cost of Conscience. He was then installed in England before Continuers here had a chance to consult together about the best way forward.

In your letter to me of February 20th you wrote:

*"From the time that women were ordained to the diaconate in the Church of England, (Fr. Hamlett's) Stoke congregation had no connection with the Established Church, or the official Anglican Communion... and when the appropriate stage of growth was reached, developed into a missionary diocese. To say that Bishop Leslie's election should have involved the participation of 'Continuers' still within the Church of England is like claiming that you or I ought to be consulted about the choice of the Moderator of the Church of Scotland."*

With respect. Father, you have missed the point. The point is not that the Stoke congregation (in 1991-92) should have consulted more widely about that congregation's own arrangements for episcopal oversight (doubtless they could have carried on for a while longer with an episcopal visitor from ACC(OP)). Rather, my point is that the Stoke congregation on its own should not have presumed to **elect** a bishop in 1992 - much less establish a "missionary diocese", complete with Constitution and Canons.

Leslie Hamlett, and the American ACC bishops who consecrated him, knew very well that if the priestess legislation were passed by General Synod in November 1992, then scores of priests and thousands of laity were prepared to leave the Established Church and to try to find a common way forward as a Continuing Church. Rather than preempt this whole process of prayer and consultation, Stoke and Leslie Hamlett could have **waited**; they could have met with all Continuers in January 1993, in good faith, to seek out a possible united way forward. Instead, Hamlett allowed American bishops from ACC(OP) to consecrate him, and thereby establish a beachhead on this island for one of the warring American factions. Surely that policy was both premature and divisive.

Moreover, I, and some other participants at the nationwide meeting at Orange Street, felt that Bishop Hamlett's followers were too eager to seize the moral high ground by presenting everyone with a *fait accompli* - "the continuing church exists -join it" - accept Bishop Hamlett and the jurisdiction and structure that we have already established or take sole responsibility for a divided Continuing Church in England!

In your letter of February 20th you claim that the supporters of Bishop Hamlett could not have done otherwise:

*"If the whole lot, members and supporters, had stayed away, the fait accompli would still have been there to*

## THE OLD BELIEVER 6

*haunt the meeting and this because, in 1991, the congregation at Stoke chose the way of the ACC."*

But, Father, **there was another option**. Suppose Bishop Hamlett had broken ranks from his American sponsors, and declared himself willing to be in communion with all those who hold the essentials of Catholic Faith, Order and Morals, as expressed in the Affirmation of St. Louis? Suppose, that is, he was willing to be in communion with both ACC(OP) and the worldwide Traditional Anglican Communion (TAC)? We might have had a relatively united Continuing Church movement on this island, avoiding exclusive allegiance to either grouping; indeed. Bishop Hamlett might thereby have instigated moves towards greater unity throughout the worldwide Continuum. But such was not to be, and an historic opportunity may have passed him by.

Nevertheless, I remain hopeful that friendships can be preserved across jurisdictional lines here in England, and perhaps the next generation of ACC(OP) leaders will let go of their bitterness over developments in the USA, and drop their objections to intercommunion with the worldwide TAC. I shall pray earnestly for that day.

### *No essential differences*

As I see it, there are no essential differences in Faith, Order and Morals between the ACC(OP) and the TAC. I know that you and Bishop Hamlett claim that such differences do exist. For example, you wrote to me of your concern that a "*major conceptual shift*" has taken place in the episcopal leadership of the TAC, a shift which makes the unity of that worldwide communion based merely upon a common ideology or "principles", rather than upon a living Catholic truth.

end of Page 13

Your concern seems primarily to be based upon the Ascension Day 1991 "*Call for Unity*" of the Canadian branch of the TAC, a document which states that unity should be based upon "*principles expressed in the Affirmation of St. Louis and the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral*". But surely this is **insufficient evidence to charge the worldwide TAC with abandoning the essentials of Catholic ecclesiology!** Besides, the Continuing Church movement was founded, at least in part, precisely upon such common "principles"; that is, on a common expression of faith - the Affirmation of St. Louis. And the headings of the major sections of the Affirmation read as follows: "Fundamental **Principles**", "**Principles** of Doctrine", "**Principles** of Morality" and so on. Of course the TAC is united not only by these shared principles of faith, but also by a living, worldwide college of bishops in authentic apostolic succession, as is ACC(OP).

You also claim, Father, that the ACC(OP) has now "crossed the line" into Orthodoxy, and Bishop Hamlett quotes with approval one scholar's statement that the "*vision of the Affirmation (of St. Louis). . . was one of Western Orthodoxy*". But surely this claim is false. The Affirmation calls for the "*Continuation of Anglicanism*" in its opening paragraph, and at the end clearly states: "*We continue to be what we are. We do nothing new ... but continue as Anglicans.*" Moreover the Affirmation asks us thoroughly to receive and believe the Creed of St. Athanasius, which the Orthodox reject and which implies the Western doctrine of the Double Procession (the "*filioque*"). Nowhere does the Affirmation call into

question the Western Anglican tradition of allowing bishops to marry, nor does it make any appeal for recognition to any Eastern Patriarchate. Of course, the Affirmation did bring the Continuum at least one step closer to Orthodoxy by the acceptance of all seven Ecumenical Councils, which rules out the most puritan Anglicans from participation. But this was not meant to be "crossing the line" into Orthodoxy in such a way as to rule out Central Churchmen, or even Conciliar-minded Evangelicals from joining Continuing Anglicanism. If the leadership of ACC(OP) now wants to portray itself as Western-rite Orthodoxy, then that is itself a "major conceptual shift" which is not justified by the Affirmation upon which ACC(OP) was originally founded.

Bishop Hamlett insists that only in the ACC(OP) has Catholic Orthodoxy found expression in the "realities of the actual life of the church", that is in its canon law. Perhaps ACC(OP) does have a superior corpus of canon law. That is one of the matters English traditionalists will want prayerfully to consider in the months to come, fashioning the best canons we can for our church from a variety of sources.

But surely the reality of Catholic faith and life can be embodied in a **variety** of ways in canon law, and churches with different codes and practices can still share bonds of communion, provided they 'clearly agree on essential points of Faith, Order and Morals which those laws seek to embody and express. Canons are important, but they are a "second order" not a "first order" concern.

And surely that is why ACC(OP) is now in full communion with the relatively "low church" UECNA in America, though their canons are certainly not identical. If only the leadership of ACC(OP) would be consistent, and adopt the same policy towards the worldwide TAC, which has no objections to intercommunion with them - indeed, has never severed communion with ACC(OP) at all. The door remains open.

### *A choice to make*

Finally, in your letter to me of February 20th, you asked me to concede that there are now two distinct paths open to English Traditionalists: "Pan-Anglicanism" (TAC) and "Fulfilled Anglicanism" (ACC(OP)). Even if this is so, and even if this justifies the existence of separate jurisdictions here in England, taking somewhat different paths, nevertheless these two jurisdictions retain so much in common, in all the essentials, that there is **no reasonable excuse for the severance of communion between them.**

And even if there is now sufficient reason for a severance of communion - if, as you say, ACC(OP) has truly "crossed the line" into Orthodoxy - then surely ACC(OP) is no longer an Anglican church at all, much less "fulfilled Anglicanism". More accurate terms for the two bodies would then be "Clarified Anglicanism" (TAC) and "Western-rite Orthodoxy" (ACC(OP)), though it remains doubtful whether the Eastern Orthodox will welcome into their fold a church with Western sacramental devotions, married bishops, and the "*filioque*".

In any case, I remain a "conviction Anglican", and the Traditional Anglican Communion (TAC) gives me the chance to continue as such, in an Anglicanism clarified

## THE OLD BELIEVER 6

and strengthened by the Affirmation of St. Louis. As the Affirmation itself puts it:

*"We, being moved by the Holy Spirit to walk only in that way, are determined to continue the Catholic Faith, Apostolic Order, Orthodox Worship and Evangelical Witness of the traditional Anglican Church."*

Yours in Christ

The Revd. Robert Stackpole, BA, MLitt..

end of page 14

### ORTHODOXY - SOME ISSUES

*Canon Edward Every, formerly of Jerusalem*

I write as a "continuer" who is hoping to see negotiations for union between the Continuing Anglicans and the Orthodox. I notice that in the first issue of the "Old Believer" some observations were made about Eastern Orthodoxy.

#### *One Church, one Baptism*

I take the first two points together. The claim to be the One authentic Church is made for their own Communion by the Orthodox in terms more extreme than those employed by the Roman Catholics. The Roman Catholic Church thinks that all validly baptised unconscious infants are Roman Catholics until they become heretics or schismatics. The Orthodox believe that, in an important theological sense, there is no baptism except in their Church. Any heretic or schismatic, like any non-Christian, on joining the Orthodox Church can express the wish to be baptised and chrismated in her, after confessing all past sins, and this wish will be accepted. Some Western Christians, including Roman Catholic priests, who joined the Orthodox Church in recent years, were so baptised at their own requests. More often, Orthodox parents ask for the Orthodox baptism of their children while stating that they were baptised previously in a non-Orthodox way. The parents may say that the previous baptism was an act of proselytism and the Orthodox clergy, whatever their treatment of adult converts might be, will disregard the previous baptism and administer Orthodox baptism at the parents' request. In the 18th and 19th centuries it was customary among the Orthodox in the Turkish Empire to baptise all converts from Churches not baptising by triple immersion.

It has to be remembered that the motive for a change from one Church to another is often matrimonial. Many of the poorer Orthodox became Roman Catholics or married Roman Catholics to gain material or social or educational advantages. The Orthodox Bishops wanted to discourage proselytising efforts among their people and also mixed marriages. So they ruled that if a family came back to Orthodoxy from Roman Catholicism or Protestantism everyone concerned who had not been baptised in the Orthodox Church must be duly baptised and that people marrying into Orthodox families must accept Orthodox baptism.

Among the Russians at the same period and among all the Orthodox at earlier and later periods, converts from the Western Churches, including Protestants, were received into the Orthodox Church by *chrismation* and absolution. It is a common theological view among the Orthodox, though not unanimously accepted, that one sacrament can do the work of another. Absolution is a second baptism and chrismation is an integral part of Christian initiation. If the convert believes that he has been baptised in the past, absolution after confession and

chrismation in the present convey what is lacking and make the baptism valid. Converts never baptised, such as Quakers, cannot be thus received.

Likewise episcopally ordained priests can join the Orthodox Church as laymen, if the Orthodox Bishop so decides. But it is possible for the Orthodox Bishop, by absolving a Roman Catholic priest and con-celebrating with him, to empower him to be an Orthodox priest.

It is interesting that the original article regards the wide divergence in practice about baptism among the Orthodox as an argument for a *magisterium*. It is now generally thought that the non-Chalcedonians have convinced the Orthodox of their belief that Jesus Christ is truly God and truly assumed real humanity. If this happens, the two Eastern Communion will recognise one another as Orthodox and will be One Church. But it seems to me that some problems will not be solved. The uniting Churches must take different views of their separate pasts, while agreeing about their present and their future.

#### *Marriage and Divorce*

Marriage is the subject of two different theologies, both ancient. For Rome, all human marriage is monogamous and indissoluble by natural law. This has been modified by complex legislation; but it continued for centuries to affect the treatment of polygamy by Roman Catholic missionaries. The Orthodox are clearly aware of the differences between heathen, Jewish, Christian and Islamic marriages. The Sacrament of marriage is only administered to baptised and communicant Orthodox Christians, the minister of the sacrament being the priest. The permission of the Bishop is necessary. For centuries, all second marriages were discouraged. Fourth marriages are forbidden. No-one who has married twice can be ordained. No-one who has married twice can marry a candidate for the priesthood, even before his ordination. The Eastern Roman Empire had marriage laws dating from long before the recognition of Christianity as the state religion and these laws, modified under Christian influence, still allowed divorce in a court of law. This is not the same as divorce decreed by the husband, as in Jewish and Islamic laws. I am told that no synod ever promulgated canons in favour of divorce. But in the Islamic countries the Bishops of the Churches were expected to adjudicate among the Christians in all matters of family law, including marriage, according to the laws of the nations defeated by the Islamic armies. The Orthodox were assumed to be descended from subjects of the Roman Empire.

Our Lord forbade the divorce decree issued by husbands - and in St. Mark 10 verse 12b that issued by wives (unknown to the Old Testament law). But St. Matthew 19 verses 11-12 suggests that the precept cannot be received by all. It is the common Orthodox contention that divorces granted, by an ecclesiastical court are an exercise of the power to bind and to loose, and are not identical with the divorce forbidden in the Gospels.

#### *Palamism*

*Palamism* is supported by the words of the services used by the Orthodox on the first two Sundays of Lent. The second Sunday commemorates Archbishop Gregory Palamas - the choirs sing "*Eternal memory*" with reference to him. On the first Sunday, they sing "*anathema*" with reference to his enemies.

end of Page 15

## THE OLD BELIEVER 6

The synods of this controversy are not Oecumenical and their terminology is not *de fide*. However, Orthodox theologians who are Palamites contend that Palamism is scriptural. God is unknowable and incomprehensible in essence - "*no man hath seen God*". But He is revealed in action. The light of the Transfiguration is not created light or created grace - it is God in His self-communication. God says to Moses, "*Thou shall see my back, but my face shall not be seen*".

### *Devotion to Mary*

Archbishop Anthony Bloom points out that the words "*Save us*" are never used in any prayer to any saint other than the *Theotokos*. In many parish churches I have heard the choir sing "*Intercede for us*" at the point where the older custom was to sing "*Save us*". The prayer does not appear in either form in the printed texts of the liturgy. But it is contended that saying "*O Holy Mother of God, save us*" is a solemn recognition of the saving power of Mary's consent to the Incarnation, which symbolises human freedom. We do not save ourselves - Pelagius is wrong. But we are saved, under God, by a human will, willing that God should be incarnate.

This is not rejecting the criticism in the original article of what the Orthodox actually do. Much more can be said about it I cannot predict what the Orthodox will say about our Appeal. But I would like this comment to go in the "Old Believer", as the Old Believers of the 17th and 18th centuries were receptive of the Eastern Orthodox Tradition.

*Editorial comments: Of course we respect Orthodoxy, but the uniting Churches, if unity is to be attempted, must take different views of their separate pasts. Some readers may welcome an explanation of a few terms. Chrismation is anointing with chrism and corresponds broadly to our confirmation. The magisterium is the "teaching office" of the Roman Catholic Church, a centralising force lacking in Orthodoxy as in Anglicanism but also unknown to the Early Church. Palamism (the teaching of Archbishop Gregory Palamas) is loosely similar to the status of Thomism (the teaching of Thomas Aquinas) at some times in the Roman Church - highly valued but not infallible. Theotokos means God-bearer, and functions in Orthodox devotion similarly to the Western "Mother of God" - both terms were originally*

*introduced to defend the truth of the Incarnation, and only later became part of devotion to Mary.*

### **PRINCIPLES?**

*A comment from the Assistant Editor*

Some people think that whenever we talk about "principles" we are evading clear commitments. This could happen and we appreciate that it has happened in the Church of England. Clear paper commitments in Prayer Book, Ordinal, Articles and Canons have been evaded. But what lesson should we learn? Is more paper, in the form of carefully crafted canons, the answer? And where are we going? Paper has not protected us once; why should it do so in future? Paper is no better protection than the commitment of those with power to abide by it. So, in Continuing terms, Fr. Whiting is quite right. We must choose our Bishops carefully, since we believe we must give them power to govern the Church. Of course we bind them to conform to the paperwork - but it is their character, not our ability to build a

defensive network of legal checks, on which we must depend.

Surely the early Church used a comprehensive code of canons! Surely the persecuting Empire would have been delighted to provide legal remedies for any breach! Of course not: the Church before Constantine depended upon mutual trust and integrity. And if we cannot trust our leaders and each other, there can be no continuing Church. No paper system will substitute for deserved trust. Yet there must be paper, we must sketch what we are. People cannot be asked to "buy a pig in a poke". Here are some ideas. They are completely unofficial as far as M.C.C.E. and "Continuers in the Faith" are concerned, and provided so that others can disagree and improve on them.

Initially, we continue with the Book of Common Prayer, Ordinal, Articles and Canons (the latter as they were, say, in 1969 - a short, clearly defined and public corpus which can be traced by anyone who wants to know), making only those changes obviously dictated by our new status. For example, if we do not have archdeacons and rural deans, we delete the canons which refer to them. It may well be that the Ordinal and Articles should not be changed subsequently. But it makes little sense to maintain the Book of Common Prayer when most of us do not use it. While congregations must be enabled to maintain their current usages, we will need a common standard of worship and doctrine. Yet that will be the work of several years, and not the most urgent task either. I suggest that we might determine that revision will be limited to the sound work that was officially done between 1928 and Series I - so anyone who joins us knows the limits of change we envisage.

It seems inappropriate to make either the Quadrilateral or the Affirmation of St. Louis into new standards; they simply recall us to existing standards. However, if the Affirmation were to be taken as a guiding principle, then we would have to rework the canons so as to accept all seven Ecumenical Councils. Our Articles state that General Councils can err and have erred; to give Ecumenical status to the seven councils is not the same as to require us to accept their every decision, both doctrinal and merely canonical.

As a result of our new status, we would be able to require both clergy and laity to take "subscription and assent" seriously. Worshipping with us is one thing, membership (which includes the vital "negative voice" of the laity in appointments and changes in worship) is another. Mutual trust goes with mutual commitment to the same formularies; not the least weakness in the "national church" has been the impossibility of requiring commitments from the laity and so the erosion of commitments from the clergy. But we must keep due proportion. Belief in God is much more fundamental than acceptance of the Creeds; a lesser duty is owed to more local standards; canons require obedience rather than the assent of faith. It is all too easy to invert the proportion!

So there you have a brief account of what we might do - the building blocks and the limits. It is more definite than "principles"; the question for each of us is whether we can trust each other on this basis. No trust, no church.

end of Page 16;

page 17 was devoted to "Continuers in the Faith"

**Continuing, not concluding**

## THE OLD BELIEVER 6

From the Assistant Editor

Once again, thanks to everybody who makes the "Old Believer" possible, and in particular to those who send donations. In this stage of preparing for the restored Church it is vital that we keep together, and gather in those who know they will have no place in the priestess body. The "Old Believer" is the best mechanism, apart from personal contact, which we have. So we must use it.

I appealed for "feedback". Two responses come to mind. I was detected in a "different to"; I do acknowledge my fault. More important, I casually referred to "Intention" without explanation. Of course traditionalists with an old-style theological education have no problem with such jargon, and, as C. S. Lewis pointed out, the use of such a technical vocabulary saves a lot of time. But he also showed it is useless for non-specialists. As our judgement of the Manchester declaration by the bishops will be much affected by this very point, an explanation is necessary.

Sacraments depend not on the minister but on the promise of God. Normally, we rightly take it for granted that the minister (whether bishop ordaining, or priest celebrating Holy Communion, or lay person baptising in an emergency) means to do what God wanted and what the Church has therefore formalised. Since the Ordinal declares that our purpose is reverently to continue the Ministry of the Church of God, a bishop using that Ordinal (or indeed, the ASB, since that document cannot change any doctrine) must be understood to be meaning to do just that, unless he very clearly asserts the contrary - at which point we say that his "intention" is defective. He is inventing something of his own and no longer administering the Sacrament.

Those who want a more detailed explanation should study the nineteenth century controversy between ourselves and the Roman Catholics about the validity of Anglican Orders, which largely turns on this very point. It is not therefore a modern invention of the Continuing Church movement, but is implicit in the "**Answer of the Archbishops**" to the papal decree **Apostolicae curae**.

Now the importance for the Manchester declaration is that all the bishops have *carefully and with forethought* agreed that after the priestess canon there will only be one class of ordination to the priesthood in the Church of England, which will include priestesses. This is a clear and premeditated departure from the Ministry of the Church and our own Church's former intention. Even those who will not ordain women have committed themselves to this newly-invented androgynous priesthood. Their intention will be defective; not even their ordinations of men, not even using the Prayer Book Ordinal, will be valid. That is what their own decision implies.

In a sense, they are wise. How can they keep their body together if they are not doing the same thing? What unity is it to have four sorts of priest - Mr. W validly ordained already, Mr. X validly ordained by a bishop who rejects the ordination of women and retains the proper intention, Ms. Y whom we reject, and Mr. Z ordained (or rather not) in the same ceremony alongside her? But this only exposes the simple truth: you can't have your cake and eat it. If you think the nonconformists are right and there is no distinctive ministerial Order, then join them and of course either sex can be non-priestly "ministers". If you

think the vast majority since the start of Church history is right, then continue "Holy Orders" and don't ordain women. **There is no middle course.**

### The British Church

#### George Herbert "The Temple"

*We wish to continue Anglicanism not because we are "High Church" but because we take a high view of the Church. This is precisely the view of the Fathers of the Oxford Movement - we should recognise the Notes of the Church in the Church of England as it is (or, alas, recently was) rather than seek ceremonial change. Herbert died in 1633, so he too is not describing the achievements of Archbishop Laud but recognising the worth of the Church of England before then. If some of the imagery is surprising, it is mild compared to the very similar argument in John Donne's "Show me dear Christ thy spouse" (Divine Poems 18).*

I joy, dear Mother, when I view  
Thy perfect liniments, and hue  
Both sweet and bright.

Beauty in thee takes up her place,  
And dates her letters from thy face,  
When she doth write.

A fine aspect in fit array,  
Neither too mean, nor yet too gay,  
Shows who is best.

Outlandish looks may not compare:  
For all they either painted are,  
Or else undrest.

She on the hills, which wantonly  
Allureth all in hope to be  
By her preferred,

Hath kissed so long her painted shrines,  
That even her face by kissing shines,  
For her reward.

She in the valley is so shy  
Of dressing, that her hair doth lie  
About her ears:

While she avoids her neighbours' pride,  
She wholly goes on th'other side,  
And nothing wears,

But dearest Mother, (what those miss)  
The mean thy praise and glory is,  
And long may be.

Blessed be God, whose love it was  
To double-moat thee with his grace,  
And none but thee.

end of Page 18 and last