Scottish Episcopal Institute Journal

Enquiries

Disclaimer

The opinions, beliefs and viewpoints expressed by the authors in the *Scottish Episcopal Institute Journal* do not necessarily reflect the opinions, beliefs and viewpoints of the Scottish Episcopal Church, the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church or the Scottish Episcopal Institute.

Copyright

Revised Monday 17 December 2018

[Foreword](#)

DAVID JASPER
Convener of the Doctrine Committee
of the Faith and Order Board of the Scottish Episcopal Church
and
Professor Emeritus of Theology and Literature (University of Glasgow)

If there was a time to discuss bishops in the Scottish Episcopal Church, it is now. Three out of the seven dioceses have recently elected new ones, and a fourth is about to do so. A new Primus is just over a year in office. And the experience of the procedures of securing the episcopal tradition have been anything but smooth. Everything suggests that the role of a bishop in a diocese, and the College of Bishops in the policy of the church, is a contested field of clashing expectations. The maintenance of seven dioceses with all their appurtenances lays a burden of increasingly heavy dimensions on a shrinking body. Without some serious attempt to take our bearings, the life of our new bishops promises to be solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short – and, of course, the life of the Scottish Episcopal Church with it.

There are other, wider-ranging reasons to focus attention on this point. In the unfolding of the crisis of the Anglican Communion the role of bishops, and especially of primates, has achieved a sudden prominence, with models of episcopal authority drawn from the patristic era to justify a flurry of mutual excommunications. And far beyond the Anglican Communion, as well as within it, increasingly anxious questions about how juridical standards of institutional probity set by public law are reconcilable with the pastoral and teaching ministry that Christians claim that bishops exercise, take us back to certain stubborn problems of the middle ages.

The essays collected here, for each of which only the author is responsible though some result from informal discussions among the authors, are offered to bishops, clergy and laity as an incentive to thought, prayer and discussion. And because, four centuries ago, bishops were something Scottish Christians bloodied one another's noses about, they are accompanied by a courteous reflection offered by an ecumenical partner in the majority tradition in Scotland, as well as voices from other Provinces of the Communion. May they be a first word in taking bearings, not the last!

The Question of Episcopal Authority in the Scottish Episcopal Church[1]

DAVID JASPER
Convener of the Doctrine Committee
of the Faith and Order Board of the Scottish Episcopal Church
and
Professor Emeritus of Theology and Literature (University of Glasgow)

This brief paper will give particular attention to the nature of episcopacy in the contemporary Scottish Episcopal Church (SEC) and, initially, with particular reference to its close geographical neighbour in the Anglican Communion, the Church of England. Historically the description of the SEC as 'the English Church' in Scotland is incorrect but has enough of the truth in it to be an awkward presence. In an essay describing the residencies of Queen Victoria in Balmoral in the early 1870s, Owen Chadwick remarks that while the Queen herself was committed to worship in the established Church of Scotland, many

> Of the English who came north refrained from attending the services of the Church of Scotland, or of the Free Church of Scotland, because they wanted an English form of service and knew that they would find it in the Episcopal Church of Scotland; and if they were instructed Anglicans, they knew that the Church of England was in communion with the Episcopal Church and that they might loyally receive the sacrament at its altars.[2]

But important though the nineteenth century and its revival of the Scottish Episcopal Church largely through the somewhat Romantic sensitivities of the Oxford Movement[3] is, the real story underlying the drift of this essay on episcopacy must begin rather earlier.

---

[1] Originally presented at a meeting of the Church and the Academy (https://www.churchandtheacademy.org) on Saturday 16 June 2018.

[2] Owen Chadwick, 'The Sacrament at Crathie, 1873', in *Scottish Christianity in the Modern World*, ed. by Stewart J. Brown and George Newlands (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), p. 178.

[3] See, Stewart J. Brown, 'Scotland and the Oxford Movement', in *The Oxford Movement: Europe and the Wider World, 1830-1930*, ed. by Stewart J. Brown

In his *History of the Scottish Episcopal Church* (1843), John Parker Lawson emphasizes from the beginning the absolute centrality of the episcopate in the history of the SEC. Everything derives from the bishop.

> The successions in the Episcopate are carefully narrated as of the utmost importance, for while the ordinations of Deacons and Presbyters are merely local and personal, the Church at large has a vital interest in the consecration of every bishop.[4]

Lawson begins his history with the pronouncement that 'the Church in Scotland twice received the Episcopal Succession from the Church of England, first in 1610, and again in 1661.'[5] In fact, of course, the Episcopal Church has its origins from an earlier date – 1582 – when the Church of Scotland rejected episcopal authority and adopted Presbyterian government and a reformed theology. Through all the vicissitudes of the seventeenth century, the significant moment, after the Glorious Revolution of 1688–89, was the final restoration of Presbyterianism in the established Church of Scotland, and the consequent placement of Episcopalians as Dissenters. In 1689 about sixty Episcopalian clergy were 'rabbled' out of their livings by Presbyterian mobs[6], while loyalty to the Stewart dynasty in the Jacobite risings of 1715 and 1745 brought about the near extinction of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, penal laws being rescinded only in 1792.

The recovery of the SEC in the nineteenth century was largely under Tractarian influence, the Oxford Movement being naturally drawn to its preservation of spiritual independence and anti-Erastian Church principles. While he was still an Anglican, John Henry Newman wrote rhapsodically in *Lyra Apostolica* (1836) of 'our brethren of the North…. Cast forth to the chill mountain air'. Indeed, the survival of Scottish episcopacy was an act of defiance against Presbyterian compromise on the historic orders of the threefold ministry. The question that this poses today is of the nature of this apostolic and catholic calling in Scotland, and thus the particular nature of the Scottish episcopate. To what is God calling the SEC in its particular ministry and mission? The Scottish bishop is elected in each diocese and, unlike the bishop in the Church of England, is not appointed by the monarch

---

and Peter B. Nockles (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 56-77.

[4] John Parker Lawson, *The History of the Scottish Episcopal Church* (Gallie and Bayley, 1843), p. x.

[5] Ibid. p. 1.

[6] See, Stewart J. Brown, *The National Churches of England, Ireland and Scotland, 1801-46* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 41.

as Head of the Church and through the Crown Appointments Commission. He or she therefore does not have any rightful participation in national government, unlike Anglican bishops in England, twenty-six of whom sit in the House of Lords. It is clear why the Tractarians found the Scottish bishops so important.

Let us begin briefly with the matter of authority. Many years ago R. P. C. Hanson remarked that 'authority for the Christian is a combination or harmony of several forms of authority, all fused in faith.'[7] In the same essay Hanson asserts that 'the authority of the church lies ultimately in the Word of God whom it obeys and whose witness it finds in the Bible.'[8] The church's authority is not its own but is of God and for the SEC we might add that this authority is rooted in Scripture and Sacrament. Of these, within the apostolic and catholic tradition, the bishop is the primary guardian. Here is not the place to rehearse again the early history of episcopacy and the nature of its authority. New Testament evidence is inconclusive and in Acts of the Apostles, at least, the terms '*episcopos*' and 'presbyter' seem to be used interchangeably (20. 17, 20. 28). But by the early second century, in St. Ignatius, bishops, presbyters and deacons are quite distinct orders of ministry.

I will take here the important, if debated, evidence, probably from the early third century, of the *Apostolic Tradition*, sometimes ascribed to Hippolytus, on the prayer used for the consecration of a bishop. This document makes it quite clear that a bishop is chosen by God to be a 'high priest' whose task it is to be a shepherd of the flock and offer to God the gifts of the Church.

> Father, who knowest the hearts of all, grant upon this Thy servant whom Thou hast chosen for the episcopate to feed Thy holy flock and serve as Thine high priest, that he may minister blamelessly by night and day, that he may unceasingly behold and propitiate Thy countenance and off to Thee the gifts of Thy holy Church.
>
> And that by the high priestly Spirit he may have authority "to forgive sins" according to Thy command, "to assign lots" according to Thy bidding, to "loose every bond" according to the authority Thou gavest to the Apostles, and that he may please

---

[7] R. P. C. Hanson, 'Authority', in *A New Dictionary of Christian Theology, ed. by* Alan Richardson and John Bowden (London: SCM, 1983), p. 60.
[8] Ibid. p. 59.

> Thee in meekness and a pure heart, offering to Thee a sweet smelling savour.[9]

A number of things are to be noted here. First, it is God who chooses a bishop, 'chosen from all the people', and thus any form of election needs to recognize this as a fundamental element in that process. The role of the bishop is high priestly in service to God, his (or now, her) ministry, with its apostolic authority, to the church reflecting this. Apart from the forgiving of sins, the duty of the bishop is to 'assign lots', that is, to assign ecclesiastical duties, 'derived from the allocation of priestly duties by lot in the OT'.[10] Thus it is clear that the bishop's primary duty is to God and then as a pastor 'to feed Thy holy flock'.

The role of the bishop has always been subject to the particular circumstances of the church in different times and places. It seems quite clear today that a bishop in the SEC functions in the light of the church that somehow found its vocation after 1690 to preserve, against all the odds, the catholic and apostolic tradition in Presbyterian Scotland, and was perceived as such through the admittedly Romantic vision of the Tractarians in the nineteenth century as evidenced by such buildings at Glenalmond's College of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, St. Ninian's Cathedral in Perth, and the College of the Holy Spirit in Cumbrae (the latter two building being designed by William Butterfield, the builder of Keble College, Oxford) in the 1840s. Cumbrae would later become the Cathedral of the Isles in the diocese of Argyle and the Isles. With its history of persecution, the SEC was described by Sir Walter Scott as 'the ancient but poor and suffering Episcopal Church'.[11] For William Perry in his book *The Oxford Movement in Scotland* (1933), the SEC was at the very heart of the Scottish identity as a spiritual and social force.

In this context it was very clear that the Scottish bishop is allowed a spiritual freedom that is not available in the same way to English bishops, entrenched as they are in the fabric and politics of the national church. The nature of the Scottish bishops' authority is less easy to define but theologically, in a way, more profound. They might, it could be said, provide an opportunity for proper theological reflection on the Anglican 'tripod' of Scripture, tradition and reason as the tools to 'think theologically' as a church and to think of the church theologically. A valuable exercise would be

---

[9] *The Treatise on The Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome*, ed. by Gregory Dix, rev. by Henry Chadwick (London: SPCK, 1968), pp. 5-6.

[10] Paul F. Bradshaw, Maxwell E. Johnson and L. Edward Phillips, *The Apostolic Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), p. 36.

[11] Quoted in Stewart J. Brown, 'Scotland and the Oxford Movement', p. 56.

to return to the mind of the 'high church evangelical' George Howard Wilkinson (1833-1907), Bishop of Truro and then Bishop of St. Andrew's and Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church. As a parish priest in London, Wilkinson had pioneered parish missions for which he was accused of a mixture of 'unhealthy emotionalism, Methodist extravagance and the Romish confessional'![12] In fact, as a bishop in Scotland holding a high doctrine of the Eucharist as a sign of Christ's presence, Wilkinson sustained a remarkably balanced ministry of practical ethics, theological reflection based on scriptural principles and the Prayer Book, and sacramental liturgy. He affirmed that 'we come to Holy Communion first of all, as says the Catechism, in order that we may offer to our God the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of Christ.'[13]

Bishop Wilkinson is a good example of a bishop who sees his place as a theologically reflective centre in the church, and despite his English episcopal experience represents a clear alternative to the 'feudal' model of the English episcopate, most apparent in such titles as the 'Prince Bishop of Durham'. While the office of bishop is not simply to be equated with the idea of theologian, nevertheless a bishop's calling is certainly to ensure the theological self-reflection of the church and its ministry. At the same time, Bishop Wilkinson's biographer, Arthur James Mason, makes it clear how the particular history of the Scottish Episcopal Church defines the deeply pastoral nature of the bishop within and alongside the ordained ministry of the church while being the primary witness to 'the Divine purpose in the institution of the Apostolic ministry'. [14] The principle of leadership in equality is maintained by the replacement of the title of Archbishop by that of the Primus (*inter pares*), who is elected by his or her fellow bishops. Within the threefold ministry, Mason indicates also the historical origins of the Scottish bishop's priestly function alongside his fellow clergy in the particular stringent circumstances of the eighteenth century.

> In the last century Scottish Bishops had no chapters, no cathedrals, usually devoted themselves to a parochial charge, often in another bishop's diocese, and occasionally made a confirmation tour.[15]

---

[12] William Marshall, *Scripture, Tradition and Reason* (Dublin: The Columba Press, 2010), p. 153.

[13] Quoted in D. Voll, *Catholic Evangelicalism* (London: Faith Press, 1963), p. 64.

[14] Arthur James Mason, *Memoir of George Howard Wilkinson* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909), Vol. II, p. 370.

[15] Ibid. p. 370.

Even after the rescinding of the penal laws in 1792 at the end of the 'wilderness years', and the renewal of canonical discipline in the Synod of 1809 which forbade a bishop to interfere in any diocese but his own,[16] in this form of the episcopate the history of the eighteenth century persecutions casts its shadow over the SEC, and it is a shadow that is, I am suggesting, not without its virtues.

For this history maintains, to an extent, a safeguard for the spiritual, theological and sacramental functions of the bishop in what Hippolytus calls his high priestly role and prevents them from being overwhelmed by bureaucratic matters of government, the improper exercise of authority, and managerialism. To fall prey to such false priorities in any system that seeks to hear and discern God's call in the ordination of a bishop can only be described as an act of bad faith.

In his brief history of the Scottish Episcopal Church in the twentieth century, Bishop Edward Luscombe acknowledges that the SEC's procedure for the election of bishops under Canon 4 (by far the longest of all the Canons in the 1995 Code) is flawed, it being 'reminiscent of the mythical little girl who had a little curl, right in the middle of her forehead'.[17] The current dilemmas of the SEC with regard to the use of Canon 4 are by no means a new phenomenon. Nevertheless, it remains a fact that the SEC since the nineteenth century has demonstrated a theological vitality of a remarkable quality and despite (perhaps because of) its relatively small size and its position in dissent from the National Church. As Bishop Luscombe remarks, 'its theology has been developed, tried and tested by the threefold witness of Scripture, tradition and reason'.[18] One might add that its life is theologically sustained and promoted within the liturgical and worshipping life of the church, of which the bishop is the central figure, for, as the 1984 Ordinal of the Scottish Episcopal Church affirms, in words said by the Primus before the bishop-elect:

> There is one great High Priest of the new covenant, in whose name bishops preside over the church's offering and call all to be of one mind and purpose, that in unity they may present to God a single, holy, living sacrifice.

---

[16] Marion Lochhead, *Episcopal Scotland in the Nineteenth-Century* (London: John Murray, 1966), p. 50.

[17] Edward Luscombe, *The Scottish Episcopal Church in the Twentieth Century* (Edinburgh: The General Synod Office of the SEC, 1996), p. 31.

[18] Ibid. p. 124.

It is entirely appropriate to come towards a conclusion with reference to the Ordinal since it reflects very closely the 'Prayer for the Consecration of a Bishop' that we find in the *Apostolic Tradition*, and with which this brief essay began. Indeed, in the Ordinal we see a good description of the divine command to 'assign lots', as 'within the diocese the bishop ordains and sends out new ministers, guides and serves the priests and deacons who share in the bishop's responsibility to nurture the community of the baptized.'

We find no language of government here, for bishops are called by God to 'oversee and care' for the Church in succession to the apostles who were sent out by Christ, and this is effective only when they are found to be 'people under authority [who are] attentive to the Holy Spirit who leads us into all truth'.

In the discussions that preceded the preparation of this paper it was felt that use of the term 'spirituality' must be attended with great caution lest its vagueness become a danger. Nevertheless, Oliver O'Donovan suggested that the exercise of 'spiritual practices' must be central to the life, well-being and future of the church. Such practices are 'the work of prayer, of common worship, of study of Scripture, of articulating praise in a variety of means and forms, which must include both intellectual and inventive undertakings'. In all the things the bishop as apostolic and catholic, chosen by God, must be the attentive, energizing focus.

In conclusion we might summarize this paper in seven brief points. These have also been used as a basis for discussion as the diocese of Glasgow and Galloway prepares to elect its new bishop.

1. The office of the bishop within the Church is *universal* as well as *diocesan*.
2. The office of the bishop is *apostolic*, holding 'a combination of or harmony of several forms of authority, all fused in faith'.
3. The bishop is called upon to encourage, reflect upon and draw together the *theological reflection* of the Church as this underlies all of its moral, intellectual and spiritual life. The bishop is called by God to a *prayerful and informed theological leadership* rather than one driven by business models or political expediency.
4. The bishop is first and foremost a person of *prayer and worship* in the life of the Holy Spirit.
5. The bishop is a person of *vision* which is both catholic and apostolic.
6. The bishop is a force of *unity* both within and beyond the boundaries of the Scottish Episcopal Church.
7. The bishop in the Scottish Episcopal Church must be attentive to the question, '*What is God calling the SEC to be* in the conditions in which God has set us?'

A Question to Trouble Us?

OLIVER O'DONOVAN
Professor Emeritus of Christian Ethics and Practical Theology
(University of Edinburgh)

The picture David Jasper has drawn is a broadly familiar one, though it has new interest as sketched by his delicate pencil. For the Episcopal Church, emerging from the catastrophes of seventeenth-century Scotland, a restrained and non-prelatical version of episcopal government (minus endowments, periwigs, gaiters and seats with the Lords) lay at the centre of its identity. But the title of his paper refers to a *question* this familiar picture poses. What that question is is stated only tentatively, so tentatively that one might miss its drift. But enough suggestive hints are dropped along the way to allow us to pick up one or two of them, and to give the question a sharper edge. What Jasper is inviting us to ask, I think, is this: in the church in which we worship today *what has become of* that tradition of episcopal authority? *Do we still have* an episcopally led church, and does the Scottish Episcopal Church, as so conceived, survive? Is this a question that should trouble us?

The conception was, as stated in the first Canon, that it was 'a branch of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ'. This self-identification was the reason for joining battle with other Scottish Christians in the seventeenth century in the cause of episcopacy, the reason for which it was prepared to go into the wilderness in the eighteenth. Episcopacy was at the point at which it was called to witness, the token of its resolve to be one with the church of past ages. English Protestants, too, believed themselves in living continuity with the historical church derived from the apostles. But the form in which this claim emerged from the sixteenth century struggle with Rome allowed the weight of this identity to be distributed over a number of markers, so that Hooker could argue that episcopal succession was merely one such marker among others, legitimate but not essential. For the Scottish Episcopal Church, it was different. The bishops made its claimed identity credible. Do they make it credible today?

Jasper describes the ideal of the Scottish bishop as appointed by God to the service he undertook, his leadership a sign of God's own leadership. He secured the identity of the church by leading from the centre, modelling Christian discipleship by engagement in the spiritual practices and in liturgy. Enjoying, with his poverty and his political powerlessness, a freedom from obligations to government which English counterparts could not enjoy, he was able to study and teach, reflecting on Christian doctrine within the Anglican theological field of Scripture, tradition and reason. It is an ideal,

certainly, but not without concrete examples to give it some substance. David Jasper recalls George Howard Wilkinson of St Andrews from the nineteenth century; from an earlier period, we could add mention of Robert Leighton of Dunblane and Glasgow, that reluctant and irenical leader in a time of conflict, whose studious habits are architecturally commemorated by the Bishop's Study at the Mercat Cross in Culross, and whose writings on the spiritual life inspired Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection* a century and a half later.

Set alongside Jasper's exercise in historical recovery, Nicholas Taylor's contribution issues a warning, which forms an important counterpoint to it. It reminds us that in taking the question of episcopacy up in our own day we have to respond to a newer strand of tradition that our predecessors were innocent of. The critical historical studies exported from nineteenth-century Germany brought a strong dash of scepticism to bear on claims to unbroken historical continuities within the institution, but they have been broadly received by the church – not uncritically, as a new form of dogma, but as a discipline of sober epistemological humility to moderate the claims we lay upon church history. Episcopacy in past centuries has been variable in its practice and contested in its right; that is as close to a 'bare' fact as a broad generalization can get! Yet the irony is that Taylor is led by the same historical tradition to conclude with a more daring assertion of primitive monarchical episcopacy than was offered by the traditionally sanctioned narratives! The lesson we ought to draw from Taylor's reminders and hypotheses is not that monarchical episcopacy is, after all, so thoroughly rooted in the primitive church that we have finally proved the Presbyterians wrong, but that the *kind* of validating narrative that depended on being as up to speed as possible with the progress of historical studies can miss the whole theological point. The point (which is, I think, expressed in Cranmer's ordinal) is that bishops are an ancient *tradition,* through which a living gift of the Holy Spirit in leading the church can be discerned and received. The succession of laying-on-of-hands is, at most, a symbolic representation of the gift, with just such importance as such symbols may have in sustaining our commitment to search for the substance of Christian leadership. Each generation of the church has to seek afresh how God will give apostolic leadership to his church and should sustain the forms of leadership it has received as a vessel, held ready and expectant for the continued gift of this grace.

So we should read Jasper's account of the Scottish bishop as the selective account it is, bringing into focus some virtues that the institution has displayed, allowing the historical record to address needs that we sense in our own time. It is worth comparing his ideal, then, with a more recent exercise at depicting bishops from a neighbouring province. The English

archbishops commissioned a review of the body that nominates English diocesan bishops, and the report that emerged from that enquiry, published last year, attempted to clarify (out of a raft of indiscriminate and over-demanding expectations) in just what the service of the bishop essentially consists.[1] Episcopal oversight is said to be a distinct form of leadership among leaders, not supplying all the initiative in the church but ensuring the unity of many centres of initiative, forging the communicative link between the local and the worldwide church. The bishop does this as chief minister of the sacraments and through preaching and teaching out of the apostolic tradition, both to the church and to the wider public on behalf of the church. The demands of theological reflection, highlighted by Jasper, receive considerable weight in the English report. Constantly engaged in offering explanations and framing policies, bishops are required not only to be articulate, but to have a grasp of Christian understanding sufficient to command the respect of those inclined to think differently. Overlapping with Jasper's ideal, too, is the desire for a style of leadership more authentic to the church than a 'business model', and for a discernment of candidates that will follow the leading of the Holy Spirit without prejudice aroused by contentious issues. I was myself involved in the conduct of this review and listened to many English Christians voicing their ambitions and anxieties for their bishops. What was encouraging, given the 'differences' that are so much talked about, was how very convergent those ambitions and anxieties were. Needless to say, there was no nostalgia for periwigs and gaiters.

Let us explore some of the details of the picture, then, seeking more clarity, in the first place, about *why the business model creates so much unease*. Two rather obvious things must be said, just to get them out of the way. First, every place of responsibility has some business to be done, and it is better that it be done efficiently than otherwise. Secondly, the regime of public law today makes 'established churches' of us all and demands of accountability are imposed on all corporate bodies, irrespective of function or status. Then we may come to the real point: there is a vast difference between satisfying the demands of a bureaucratic system and inspiring a community to selfless pursuit of the vocation to worship and serve God. It stands to reason, given the nature of the church as a community, that it needs an exercise of leadership that is of the Spirit, not of the machine. We hear much of the over-weighty governing apparatus of the Scottish Episcopal Church, supposed to allow less room for episcopal discretion than it might. But whatever merit we allow that complaint, bureaucratic systems of some kind there will and must be.

---

[1] *Discerning in Obedience: a theological review of the Crown Nominations Commission,* GS2 Misc. 1171, September 2017, churchofengland.org.

The crucial question, on which the very existence of the church depends, is whether the bishops can be seen, and can see themselves, as *more than* the executive officers of those systems. If they can, the systems and their business will fall into place. If they cannot, episcopacy as a spiritual ministry will have been lost, together with the church to which it belonged; irrespective of whatever nostalgic title we may care to give the executive officers!

Such spiritual leadership will be grounded, in the second place, on the bishop's *ministry of word and sacrament*. Not sacrament alone, because the sacramental life of the church never does stand 'alone', but always in symbiosis with the living word of the Gospel. Sacrament is performed by repetition, but repetition may be a sign either of growing life or of creeping death, and each occasion of sacramental celebration is either a further step in obedience to the vocation of praise and mission, or it is a retreat from that vocation. The guardian of the sacraments, then, must ensure that ritual celebration and living engagement with the word constantly inform one another, and that is a teaching and a preaching role, a 'theological' ministry, one must call it, since theology is the thought-life of the church in which it weighs its existence by the criterion of the apostolic Gospel. Does this mean that every bishop must be a theologian? Not in the professional sense, of course. But a bishop must be able to digest, discern and clarify whatever is authentic in the contribution theologians offer, making it fruitful for the life of the community.

It would hardly be difficult to collect troubling indications that this ministry is widely forgotten or neglected in Scotland. Scotland is not lacking in theologians and theological resources, even in these starved days, but the experience as commonly reported is that the bishops ask nothing of them. Liturgy, meanwhile, the principle repository of theological reflection for most worshippers, remains without illumination and is felt to be disappointing, leaving an unsatisfied thirst for conceptual nourishment, which drives some to nostalgia for older and richer languages and styles, others to seek conceptual illumination on the margins rather than at the centre, in meditation groups, etc. The absence of episcopal teaching is reflected in the striking absence of wider (i.e. non-business-related) debate and discussion. If the virtual pages of this *Scottish Episcopal Institute Journal* accomplish nothing else, their welcome late arrival on the scene has at least drawn attention to the astonishing vacuum of discourse that they are now seeking to fill.

We move on, then, thirdly to the bishops' service of *connectivity,* which exists to keep the smallest parish aware that it is in touch with the life of the universal Church throughout the world and throughout all ages. (That is what the epithet 'catholic' was meant to mean.) I have heard the opinion

expressed that the operative ecclesiology of the Scottish Episcopal Church is not so much catholic as congregational, and though I cannot judge how widely that is true, I think it clear, at least, that congregations cannot be summoned to look beyond the four walls of their local place of worship merely by being offered a 'life of the diocese' to complement the 'life of the parish'. Which is not to disparage the many valuable things that may be undertaken at diocesan level, but simply to point out that a diocese is not the universal Church. Since few dioceses are more numerous than a large parish anyway, their horizon will not be much wider than that of a local parish. The bishop's function is to open the door not only to the local church but to the worldwide Church. There would be worse ways of beginning a new episcopal ministry than by inviting a partner-diocese from elsewhere in the Anglican Communion very remote from Scotland to send a delegation to visit all the churches and to share their experiences of life and ministry.

In conformity with the Anglican tradition and its own medieval history, the Scottish Episcopal Church has a national structure. But are the bishops a national institution, or is it only in dioceses that the Church is episcopally led? A bishop needs to be an amphibious being, at once local and universal, and since the default position in Scotland is that a bishop is elected by dioceses alone (until the process runs into the sand), there is a clear danger that the diocese forms too strong a horizon to a bishop's ministry. Even in England, where the default position was national appointment and means had to be evolved to incorporate diocesan perspectives, the danger as perceived today is that the local diocese's concerns bulk too large in elections. But there can clearly be no effective episcopal ministry on a wider-than-diocesan level unless there is strong conciliarity exercised among the bishops. To put the question of episcopal authority within the Scottish Episcopal Church is to ask not only whether dioceses have real bishops, but whether the House of Bishops is capable of functioning together as a conciliar body, in prayer, deliberation and teaching at the national level.

And there are more pressing horizons to catholicity than the national church and the worldwide Anglican Communion, ecumenical engagement being the chief among them. Thirst for Christian unity is the most indispensable sign of catholic identity. One might have thought that no church that had lived through the twentieth century could ever allow itself to overlook the continuing challenge of ecumenical rapprochement, yet the situation in Scotland looks almost, if not quite, as though the wind of the Spirit had simply passed it by. Efforts were made, to be sure. Thirty years ago, we may recall, Episcopal clergy received theological education alongside Church of Scotland clergy, and I remember being assured back then that it was only a matter of time... But such initiatives ruffled through the Church's hair like a summer breeze, and then died away, leaving nothing

behind but a habit of occasional formalized courtesies – and occasional far from formal discourtesy!

It is hardly surprising that our engagement with other Christian churches should have died into nothing as our sense of our own catholic identity has died. Though it may seem plausible that by ignoring other churches we are freer to attend to the authenticity of our own life, the lived experience of churches is quite different: either they retain a sense of themselves in engaging with one another, or in ignoring one another they lose their memory of who they themselves are. Corporate amnesia in an episcopal church is bound to be correlated with failures in the episcopal teaching ministry. A couple of years ago, preparing for the debate on marriage, the General Synod was presented with an argument by its Doctrine Committee that Episcopal Church doctrine was determined by its own liturgy as authorized by its own Synod, irrespective of the worldwide Anglican Communion, ecumenical partners, theological tradition – of anything, in fact, except its own legislative will. In the face of that radically separatist manifesto the bishops, supposedly the guardians of a catholic identity, maintained silence. Was it an attack of nerves on their part, or mere inattention? It hardly matters. Either way, the episode might serve as evidence, should somebody be looking for it, that the episcopal teaching ministry in the Scottish Episcopal Church is so debilitated as to leave the church's identity at the mercy of whoever speaks loudest and longest. Further evidence may be found in a prayer distributed for use in a recent episcopal election. Of what a bishop was for, what kind of person might make a good bishop, why God might want us to have a good bishop, and whether he might actually have someone in mind, this prayer showed no interest at all. It simply informed God of the constitution of the committee empowered to reach a nomination, and invited his favourable notice, in general terms, for whatever that committee might see fit to do.

Many factors have affected the work of bishops throughout the world in recent decades. The sprawling growth of public law, the disarray of worldwide Anglicanism, the predominance of new and overheated patterns of communication and interaction, all have had their effect. This requires more real episcopal leadership, not less. There are examples to be seen, by those who will look around them, of episcopal ministry growing stronger as a result. Where does the initiative rest if a revival is ever to touch the wilting Scottish Episcopal Church? In the first place, with those actually consecrated as bishops. They have to accept that the role of a bishop is no longer simply there for them to walk into and occupy in the traditional way; they have to hunt for it and rediscover it. The path of least resistance will be to conform to the business model, to chair the committees, to manage the business, to blame the committees for unpopular decisions and to wring their hands

from time to time about how little scope they have. But if the bishops make up their minds that they *will* lead episcopally, that they will *speak* to us, and speak *together* to us, and will speak to us *out of the traditions of the universal Church,* then the institutions, clumsy or efficient as they may be, will have a real influence to respond to, something to give their operations a catholic shape.

But a bishop without a church is not a bishop, and an episcopal vocation needs a formed ecclesial imagination to draw it out. The initiative rests with all of us, then, to *facilitate* episcopal leadership and to *pray* for it. And perhaps, to make things clearer in our praying, we may imagine what we might say, speaking together, to the new generation of Scottish diocesan bishops entering upon their charges. Perhaps it will be something like this: 'When practical questions arise, don't ask first what you are to *do.* Ask what you are to *teach.* The church will find out soon enough what it must do, if it has been well taught. And don't ask, what am *I* to teach? Ask, what are *we* to teach? And be prepared to pray, and work, hard and long together with your fellow-bishops in seeking out what the Holy Spirit has to say through you *collectively.* Renounce the twitters and the tweets, the one-line quickies that forge prison-bars you can't escape from. Take the time you need and be as complicated as you need to be; for if the matter really requires some complexity, the faithful will be prepared to follow you patiently. Consult widely in your deliberations, casting the net beyond your little circle of trusted staff-members and committees; learn all that you can from the labours and experiences of other churches and the legacy of the church of the past. When you go to meet the priests in your diocese, take with you the settled convictions of your faith, but leave your day-to-day opinions at home. Your task is to lead them in a discriminating search for a new word of the Lord for the new situation.'

Perhaps, after all, every attempt to describe a bishop's work runs the risk of looking idealistic. But there is a greater danger, which is that of simply forgetting the promise that is offered us in the Gospel parable: *The sheep follow him, for they know his voice.*

Bishops, Moderators and the Kirk: A Discussion to be Resumed?

DAVID FERGUSSON
Professor of Divinity (University of Edinburgh)

I am grateful to my colleagues David Jasper and Oliver O'Donovan for prompting me to revisit an important ecclesiological issue through their characteristically measured and stimulating reflections.

The office of bishop may not be quite as neuralgic for Presbyterians as first appears. Although a historical overview is impossible here, I offer the following observations. In the post-Reformation Scottish church, early attempts to blend episcopacy with Presbyterian church government failed neither through the impossibility of such a mixed polity nor through lack of virtuous examples. Margo Todd has described these experiments, noting that they worked well for a time and produced some outstanding figures such as William Cowper. The hostile polemics that were soon to become standardized Presbyterian discourse do not represent the early seventeenth-century experience. 'In fact,' she writes, 'the manuscript records of Reformed kirk sessions, presbyteries, and synods reveal that presbytery within prelacy actually worked quite well in Scotland from the Reformation until the rise of Arminian and ceremonialist bishops in the 1630s'.[1] Exactly what was understood by such an episcopal office and where authority resided remained unclear. Instead of whether there should be episcopacy, the issue was largely about what form it should take. As another commentator has remarked 'it was not so much a question of 'episcopacy: good or bad?', rather it was one of 'episcopacy: how strong and how accountable?'[2]

Nevertheless, episcopacy was resisted and finally rejected through fears that it would lead to the imposition of regal powers resulting in the dissolution of the church's Reformed identity. And these struggles are not quite as remote as they may appear to a contemporary observer. Fast forward three hundred years. The history of the Church of Scotland in the

---

[1] Margo Todd, 'Bishops in the kirk: William Cowper of Galloway and the puritan episcopacy of Scotland', in *Scottish Journal of Theology* 57(3) (2004), 300-12 (301).

[2] Alan R. MacDonald, *The Jacobean Kirk 1567-1625* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), p. 182.

twentieth century is yet to be written, but one significant though largely forgotten episode was the defeat of the so-called 'Bishops' Report' presented to the General Assembly in 1957. Supported by the Ecumenical Relations Committee and many of the leading figures of the day – Archie Craig, John Baillie and Tom Torrance – the report recommended the introduction of an episcopal office within the structures of Presbyterianism.[3] Had this been accomplished, the Church of Scotland and the Scottish Episcopal Church would surely have been united. Yet the report was defeated through a national campaign fronted by the *Scottish Daily Express*. Episcopalianism, it was argued, was a top-down English model of church government, inimical to a hard-won Scottish identity marked by more democratic and egalitarian practices. Rallied by Lord Beaverbrook and his able lieutenant Ian McColl, the Scots were urged to refuse this Trojan horse presented to the General Assembly by a group of misguided ecumenical enthusiasts led mostly by Edinburgh professors and ministers of well-heeled congregations.[4] In Glasgow, Professor Ian Henderson later wrote, 'The first serious attempt at Anglican imperialism to take over the Church of Scotland came to a head in 1957 with the publication of a Joint Report.'[5] Given these suspicions, it is not surprising to learn that the proposals were eventually defeated, since when ecumenism has struggled to recover in Scotland.[6]

This episode has yet to be fully researched. But one thing at least is clear from these debates – Scottish society has come a very long way in half

---

[3] 'Relations Between Anglicans and Presbyterian Churches', in *Reports to the General Assembly* (Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1957), pp.72-95.

[4] See John Highet, *The Scottish Churches: A review of their state 400 years after the Reformation* (London: Skeffington, 1960), pp. 153-59.

[5] Ian Henderson, *Power Without Glory: A Study in Ecumenical Politics* (London: Hutchison, 1967), p. 114. Published on the eve of the General Assembly, Henderson's book aroused widespread controversy. In a review in the *British Weekly* (25 May 1967, p. 5), J. K. S. Reid memorably described it as 'not vitriol but bile'.

[6] The mood north of the border was not helped by an editorial in *Crockford* (1958) which suggested that 'Anglicans may be forgiven for wondering whether nationalism or theology is the more important in Scottish church life'. See Highet *op. cit.*, p. 158. For an acute analysis from the perspective of Archie Craig, see Elizabeth Templeton, *God's February: A Life of Archie Craig 1888-1985* (London: BCC/CCBI, 1991), pp. 86-91. Craig remarked on a loose alliance of those who opposed episcopacy on Scriptural grounds, those whose sentiments were principally nationalist, and a large middle party of ministers who had not been directly engaged in any ecumenical interaction and saw little point in the proposals. I owe this reference to Sandy Forsyth.

a century. Two related facts stare us in the face. The first is that a majority of Scots now tell the pollsters that they belong to 'no religion'. And, given the demographics, this figure is likely to increase. Second, contemporary expressions of Scottish national identity are secular rather than religious.[7] The notion of a distinctive Protestantism that characterizes Scottish nationhood within the wider context of the UK is absent from nationalist discourse. To a contemporary student, the campaign waged by the *Scottish Daily Express* will seem quaint if not vaguely sectarian. Today, it is hard to imagine a tabloid headline hailing a vote by the Presbytery of Glasgow. Yet this much altered political context might afford an opportunity to reassess the past and to ask some pertinent questions about the nature of personal oversight, pastoral care, and public advocacy within the Church of Scotland.

The report of 1957 sought to blend two polities in ways that actually make good sense. If Episcopalianism needed to recognize the value of a more corporate dimension to church government, then Presbyterianism ought to register the value of a presiding figure in presbytery. This office would be more permanent than that of a one-year moderator – here today, gone tomorrow – and would serve a useful purpose in relation to oversight and leadership. There are echoes here of Calvin's low-key endorsement of an episcopal figure.[8] Set aside by fellow ministers of Word and sacrament as a 'primus inter pares', a bishop could fulfil an important function in the corporate life of the Reformed church.

My own view is that more structured forms of personal leadership and oversight are badly needed in the Church of Scotland today. A brief perusal of the Kirk's website reveals the extent to which the Moderator of the General Assembly is now required to offer media comment on a daily basis. But, having learned how to do this effectively, he or she is discharged after one year in post. As a disciplinary body, a presbytery is hampered by frequent changes of office-bearer and often a process of intervention in disciplinary matters which comes painfully late in serving the unity and peace of the church. And ministers complain repeatedly about a lack of pastoral care and oversight, leaving them isolated and vulnerable. While support is heroically offered by retired ministers, loyal friends or an overburdened presbytery clerk, an enhanced office of regional oversight would do much to augment these ad hoc processes. The Church of Scotland

---

[7] Nevertheless, at the time of the SCIFU talks in 2000 George Rosie could still argue that the argument about bishops went to 'Scotland's sense of itself'. *New Statesman Scotland,* 24 April 2000, pp. 36-37.

[8] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. by Ford Lewis Battles (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960), IV, 4.2-3.

is now moving, albeit in low gear, towards the reduction of the number of presbyteries to create more viable and semi-autonomous regional bodies. As this happens, these presbyteries will need improved ways of coordinating their work within a single national strategy. We can expect this process of reform to generate a demand for stronger regional leadership, thus providing an opportunity to reconsider the potential of an episcopal function within the contemporary church, perhaps through an extended moderatorial office. Within this context, more publicly prominent figures would likely find themselves cast in an advocacy role. Against a strengthening secular headwind, they would be required to articulate, defend and interpret the Christian faith to internal and external audiences. Might this raise the church's theological game and counteract some of the anti-intellectual trends that are increasingly evident? During a recent review of the Church of Ireland College, I was struck by the Archbishop's remark that he was unwilling to countenance a scenario in which his clergy would preach to congregations better educated than they were. We would benefit from such voices in Scotland.

Some scepticism from both sides will surround these arguments. Are not these prescriptions for a more efficient church rather than claims for the historic episcopate? Is not the 'primus inter pares' a parish minister who has been deployed for a regional function, as opposed to the holder of an ecclesiastical office constituted by apostolic succession? And does this merely repeat the strategy of 1957 which was perceived by its critics as a craven attempt to accommodate an ecclesiology that compromised the Reformed marks of the church and cast doubt on the validity of its orders? To all this, we might respond by pointing to ecumenical work that views the episcopal office as belonging not to the *esse* of the church, but to its *bene esse.*[9] A valuable office, with deep historical roots, it can be adapted and deployed to enhance the life of the church. In any case, there are longstanding models of episcopacy across the Protestant churches in Europe which deserve greater attention within the Kirk.

The Church of Scotland has moved some way on liturgy, the seasons of the Christian year, the value of pilgrimage and more frequent celebration of the sacrament. There is less Protestant rigidity in approaches to church music, clerical garb and forms of worship. In much of this, we have gained a renewed appreciation of the catholicity of the Reformed tradition. Soon it may be time to revisit and improve upon those shrill debates surrounding episcopacy which scuppered the process of church union over sixty years ago. Scottish identity has shifted decisively in its signature expressions; a

---

[9] E.g. *Leuenberg, Meissen and Porvoo*, ed. by Wilhelm Hüffmeier and Colin Podmore (Frankfurt: Otto Lembeck, 1995).

more pragmatic and less highly charged conversation about episcopacy should now be possible. A Church in Scotland? If not, why not?

The Biblical and Historical Foundations of Episcopacy

NICHOLAS TAYLOR
Rector of St Aidan's Church (Clarkston)

The *Scottish Ordinal 1984 (amended 2006)* has the Primus utter at the ordination of bishops:

> Bishops follow in the succession of the apostles whom Christ sent to proclaim the Gospel to the world and to bear authority in the community of faith. With their fellow bishops they oversee and care for the universal Church. As people under authority they must be attentive to the Holy Spirit who leads us into all truth; called into the fellowship of Christ's disciples, they must seek God's will.
>
> Within the diocese, the bishop ordains and sends out new ministers, guides and serves the priests and deacons who share in the bishop's responsibility to nurture the community of the baptized.

The claim to 'the succession of the apostles' is stated rather more boldly in the Preface to the (English) Ordinal of 1661:

> It is evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christs Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which Offices were evermore held in such reverend estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by publick prayer, with imposition of hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority.

This statement is repeated in the Preface to the Ordinal included in the Scottish Book of Common Prayer, save that the apostrophe is included in the reference to 'Christ's Church'. It is in fact not evident unto all men, or for that matter unto all women, diligently reading Scripture and other ancient Christian texts that there were from the apostolic period three orders of ministry in the Church. It was not the case when the Scottish Book of

Common Prayer was published in 1929. Furthermore, it was not the case in 1661, shortly after monarchy and episcopacy had been restored in the established churches of the three kingdoms ruled by Charles II. And, indeed, it had not been the case in Britain or elsewhere in western Christendom, either before or after the Reformation.

The controversies surrounding episcopacy at the Reformation reflect an ambiguity in mediaeval Catholicism, as to whether it is a distinct order of ministry, or merely a higher rank within the priesthood.[1] This was not resolved until the Council of Trent established the distinctive status of the episcopate, and reserved the sacrament of Orders to bishops.[2] This took place after the churches of England and Scotland had repudiated papal authority and established their own polities, after publication of the Ordinals of 1550 and 1552, and after the Articles of Religion had been promulgated in Latin. The Tridentine decrees and canons clarified Catholic doctrine on episcopacy in reaction to the various protestant schisms of the preceding decades, rather than representing a doctrine or church order rejected by the reformers. The mediaeval understanding of priesthood and episcopacy reflects the high doctrine of the Eucharist in scholastic theology, with its emphasis on the power vested in the priest whose words and manual actions effected the transubstantiation of the elements. Compared with this sacerdotal power, any additional powers vested in the episcopate were inconsequential. However far from the concerns of the reformers, the churches which repudiated this theology of the Eucharist were heirs to its logic, before they addressed questions of ministry on the basis of biblical interpretation and political expediency.

The ambiguity between priest and bishop is ancient, being evident in the writings of those few extant patristic authors who were not bishops,[3] as well as in some who were.[4] The plenitude of sacerdotal authority was understood to be vested in the priesthood, within which bishops wielded a temporal and spiritual authority, with the emphasis on the former, analogous to that of the lay aristocracy.[5] Dioceses were not so much

---

[1] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 3 Sup 35. 2; 37. 1-3; Peter Lombard, *Sententiares* 4. 24.

[2] Session xxiii (1563). *De Sacramento Ordinis*, Canon VII.

[3] Jerome, *Epistula* 146. Cf. K. Rahner, *Theological Investigations XIX* (London: Burns & Oates, 1983).

[4] Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 4.26.2, 4, 5.

[5] Thomas Cranmer, 'Questiones and Answers' 10, in *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer* ed. by J. Edmund (Cambridge: CUP 1846); *De Sacramentis*, cited with arguments for attribution, G. P. Jeanes, 'A

missional organisations as administrative units, through which revenue and harvest yields were extracted and militias conscripted to sustain, and if possible to expand, the lifestyle and power of the bishop, his concubines, catamites, illegitimate offspring, and other relations, and through which patronage could be bestowed on the same group of people and their retainers and cronies. Episcopacy was a feudal rank rather than an order of ministry.

Eastern Christianity had developed a somewhat different, and only superficially identical, threefold ordering of ministry, in which bishops, presbyters, and deacons exercise distinct degrees of priesthood. The supremacy and assertion of universal jurisdiction on the part of the bishop of Rome is without counterpart in the pretensions of oriental Patriarchs. Diocese, a term designating a unit of delegated jurisdiction introduced to imperial nomenclature by the arch-persecutor Diocletian, was applied in the eastern Church not to the jurisdiction of a bishop but to that of a metropolitan archbishop. In countries with Christian rulers, such metropolitans and archbishops have tended to align themselves with these, and in particular with often sacralised monarchies, and to espouse the nationalist, xenophobic, and often fascist values of their political rulers.[6]

While eastern Orthodox and western Catholic churches all maintain that they preserve the form and essence of ministry as inherited from the apostles, as do those of the multifarious non-episcopal Protestant denominations who think it matters, the reality is in all cases rather different. The equally implausible notion of a Spirit-filled community, in which all exercised gifts and ministries, and if authority existed it was shared equally in an unstructured and egalitarian commune, was beloved by rationalist Protestant scholars of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, who ought to have known better.[7] It is a fantasy devoid of any basis in the reality of church life at any stage in Christian history. The correlative assumption that

Reformation Treatise on the Sacraments', in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 46 (1995), 149-90.

[6] *Eastern Christianity and Politics in the Twenty First Century*, ed. by L. N. Leustean (London: Routledge, 2014); *Orthodox Christianity and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Southeastern Europe* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2014); *Political Theologies in Orthodox Christianity*, ed. by K. Stoeckl, I. Gabriel and A. Papanikolaou (London: T & T Clark, 2017).

[7] H. F. von Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries* (ET London: Black, 1969); J. D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (London: SCM, 1970); *Jesus and the Spirit* (London: SCM, 1973); E. Schweizer, *Church Order in the New Testament* (ET London: SCM, 1961).

ordered ministry, and the institutionalization of church offices, reflects a decline from the primordial and pneumatic revelry of the apostolic generation, may have anticipated the beaches of California and Hawaii during the late 1960s and early 1970s, but has no basis in historical reality. While there will always remain much that is unknown about the emergence of ordered Christian ministry, what is clear is that a variety of complex social and economic, as well as theological, processes influenced the evolution of church government during the earliest centuries.

Apostolic succession, correctly understood, consists not in a pneumatic conduit pipe, through which the Holy Spirit is transmitted from one bishop to another, or three bishops to another, from whence smaller and less potent quantities are disseminated in the ordination of presbyters, and the dregs passed by them to those who come to Baptism. Apostolic succession consists rather in continuity with the apostles in transmission of 'the faith once and for all committed to the saints' (Jude 3), the faithful proclamation and teaching of the Gospel, of which the apostles were the first preachers.[8] The earliest claim that the apostles appointed bishops, and made provision for others to be appointed to succeed them, is found in a document putatively addressed by the leadership of the church in Rome to that of Corinth, commonly known as I *Clement*.[9] This text may be as early as 70 CE, but most scholars prefer a date towards the end of the first or the beginning of the second century.[10] Hegessipus, a century later, speaks of 'a continuance of that which is proclaimed by the law, the prophets, and the Lord', sustained by the succession of bishops.[11] Irenaeus regards bishops[12] and presbyters[13] in succession to the apostles as guarantors of orthodoxy, but also identifies unity in doctrine with the Church of Rome as ensuring conformity with the apostolic faith.[14] In opposition to claims to esoteric knowledge on the part of those labelled Gnostics and other heretics, Irenaeus asserts that:

---

[8] Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 3.2.2; Tertullian, *De Praescriptione Haereticorum* 25-6, 32; Origen, *Homiliae in Leviticum* 6.5, 9.9.

[9] I *Clemens* 42; 44.

[10] C. N. Jefford, *The Apostolic Fathers and the New Testament* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2006), pp. 18-19, 163; cf. T. J. Herron, 'The More Probable Date of the First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians', *Studia Patristica* 21 (1989), pp. 106-21.

[11] Cited by Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 4.22.

[12] *Adversus Haereses* 3.3.1.

[13] *Adversus Haereses* 3.2.2.

[14] *Adversus Haereses* 3.3.1-2.

> The true knowledge is the doctrine of the apostles, and the ancient organisation of the Church throughout the whole world, and the manifestation of the body of Christ according to the succession of bishops, by which succession the bishops have handed down the Church which is found everywhere.[15]

Tertullian, not having been a bishop, emphizes the episcopate rather less than he does the corporate faithfulness of the churches:

> [The apostles] founded churches in every city, from which all the other churches, one after another, derived the tradition of the faith, and the seeds of doctrine, and are every day deriving them, that they may become churches. Indeed, it is on this account only that they will be able to deem themselves apostolic, as being the offspring of apostolic churches, the succession in bishops from the apostles being one of the tests which might be applied to discredit purveyors of heresy.[16]

Another non-episcopal church father, Clement of Alexandria, asserted that Christians who conduct themselves worthily, 'though not ordained by humans … are enrolled in the presbyterate', in heaven if not on earth.[17] Clement's intellectual successor, Origen, firmly repudiated notions of apostolic succession as belonging to the ordained ministry in general or to the episcopate in particular.[18] Further, he asserts that the most spiritual of Christians, by which he means the most learned in expounding Scripture, are the genuine leaders of the Church, in contrast to the ordained bishops and presbyters.[19] Cyprian of Carthage, citing Jesus's charge to Peter (Matt 16.18-19) against the use thereof by Stephen, bishop of Rome, to claim universal jurisdiction, asserts episcopal authority on the basis of succession from the apostles and continuity with their teaching.[20] He regards the episcopate as being of divine, and not merely apostolic, institution.[21] Jerome collapses the distinction between bishop and presbyter, and asserts the essential equality of the former in the apostolic succession, repudiating the privileging of those

---

[15] *Adversus Haereses* 4.33.8.

[16] *De Praescriptione Haereticorum* 20; 32.

[17] *Stromateis* 6.13.

[18] *Homiliae in Leviticum* 6.5.

[19] *Commentarium in Matthaeum* 10; *Commentarium in Iohannem* 32.12.

[20] *Epistula* 26, *Lapsis* 1.

[21] *Epistula* 65, *Ad Rogationem* 3.

of Rome and Constantinople.[22] There are clearly differences of emphasis among Church Fathers, writing in diverse contexts over four centuries, and reflecting quite varied experiences of episcopacy and relationships with ecclesiastical authority. It is nevertheless clear that, among those extant writings on the subject, continuity with the apostolic preaching is the cardinal consideration, and this is supported and to some extent guaranteed by the succession of bishops from apostolic church founders. It is also apparent that those Fathers who were themselves bishops expressed greater confidence in this substantiation of their authority than did those who were not. While Tertullian's relationship with the (catholic) Church clearly mutated in ways difficult to reconstruct,[23] and Origen[24] and Jerome[25] may have been frustrated in their aspirations to the sees of Alexandria and Rome respectively, we cannot overlook the fact that the most strident extant assertions of episcopal authority, and sacralisation of the episcopal office, were written by bishops whose authority was being challenged either by the exigencies of external circumstances or by presbyters, confessors, and theological writers and teachers who asserted competing claims to authority in the Church.

Whatever the Church Fathers may have believed, it is clear from the surviving records, however partial, that episcopacy derived not from the apostles but from the Christian householders who provided hospitality, patronage, and protection to the churches formed in the cities of the Roman Empire.[26] Paul's experience in Corinth demonstrates that such patrons' relations with church founders claiming the title apostle were far from unambiguous or without tension; not only did rival claimants to the title assert authority against Paul, but local patrons asserted their independence

---

[22] *Epistula* 146, *Ad Euangelum*.

[23] E. F. Osborn, *Tertullian* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997); D. I. Rankin, *Tertullian and the Church* (Cambridge: CUP, 1995); D. E. Wilhite, *Tertullian the African* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007).

[24] Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiae* 6.14, reports that Origen was repeatedly refused ordination by Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria. Origen was undoubtedly perceived as a threat to episcopal authority and may have sought ordination with the view to succeeding Demetrius.

[25] In *Epistula 45. Ad Asellam* 3, Jerome claims that he was widely regarded as the most eminently suitable successor to Damasus, bishop of Rome, and he departed the city shortly after those making the decision chose otherwise.

[26] R. W. Gehring, *House Church and Mission* (ET Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004); N. H. Taylor, *Paul on Baptism* (London: SCM, 2016); A. C. Stewart (aka A. Stewart-Sykes), *The Original Bishops* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2014).

of and patronage over the founding apostle.[27] Tension between itinerant authority figures, named as prophets and often described by scholars as charismatic, and local church leadership is apparent also in the *Didache*.[28] The transition in leadership and authority from itinerant church founders to local patrons is crucial to understanding the emergence of episcopacy.

The significance of the household, and of patronage, in the formation and extension of Christianity in the Graeco-Roman world has generally if vaguely been recognized, at least among Protestant scholars, since the work of Harnack during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[29] Widespread appropriation of a Weberian typology of authority,[30] before sociological approaches to the history of early Christianity became widely accepted in the discipline, and the uncritical description of the first Christian generations as 'charismatic', without any clear understanding of Weber's usage, meant that the role of patrons in leadership and governance was often overlooked. It was often assumed that householders provided a venue, and perhaps wider hospitality, without exercising any leadership or expecting anything in return, which conveniently avoids acknowledging the implications when those householders happened to be women.[31] More fundamentally, the nature of the household and its role in society and social structure has been overlooked. Refinements to Weber's theories in subsequent scholarship, and questions critical of its premises, were also ignored. It therefore became an accepted doctrine in critical New Testament scholarship that organized leadership emerged towards the end of the first

---

[27] J. K.-M. Chow, *Patronage and Power: Studies in Social Networks in Corinth* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992); P. Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1987); G. Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity* (ET Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1982).

[28] A. Milavec, *The Didache: Faith, Hope, and Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50-70 C.E.* (New York: Paulist, 2003); N. H. Taylor, *Lay Presidency at the Eucharist?* (London: Mowbray, 2009), pp. 39-42.

[29] A. von Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* (ET London: Williams & Norgate, 1908). More recently, E. A. Judge, *The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century* (London: Tyndale, 1960); W. A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians* (Hew Haven: Yale University Press, 1983).

[30] M. Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* (ET New York: OUP, 1947); *The Sociology of Religion* (ET Boston: Beacon, 1964).

[31] C. H. Schenk, *Crispina and her Sisters: Women and Authority in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017); K. J. Torjesen, *When Women were Priests: Women's Leadership in the Early Church and the Scandal of their Subordination in the Rise of Christianity* (San Francisco: Harper, 1995).

Christian century and reflected a spiritual decline from the charismatic anarchy of the apostolic Church.[32]

It was axiomatic of this consensus that the only New Testament writings which indicate the qualities required of church leaders, and indicate the nature of their authority, viz., the Pastoral letters (1 & 2 Timothy, Titus) could not have been written by Paul,[33] but represent the institutionalization of charisma and triumph of mammon and patriarchy during the decades after his death, leading to the episcopal autocracy articulated by Ignatius of Antioch at the beginning of the second century.[34] The circularity of the arguments became apparent, and not only to Catholic scholars, when more rigorous and methodologically sound use of sociological approaches to historical documents came to be used in New Testament studies, and in other historical disciplines, from the 1970s.[35] The presence of local authority

---

[32] Classically, R. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht I. Die geschichtlichen Grundlagen* (Munich: Von Dunker & Humblot,1892); cf. E. Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches* (London: Rivingtons, 1880); Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power*. This position is anticipated in F. C. Baur, *The Church History of the First Three Centuries* (ET London: Williams & Norgate, 1878).

[33] J. W. Aageson, *Paul, the Pauline Epistles, and the Early Church* (Peabody MA: Baker, 2008); R. F. Collins, *Letters that Paul did not Write* (Wilmington: Glazier, 1988); J. D. G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1977); M. Y. McDonald, *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-Historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings* (Cambridge: CUP, 1988); R. F. Collins, *1 and 2 Timothy and Titus* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002); M. F. Dibelius & H. G. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972); A. T. Hanson, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982); J. L. Houlden, *The Pastoral Epistles* (London: SCM, 2012). The authenticity of these letters is defended, from an evangelical perspective, by G. W. Knight, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013) and W. D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), and, more tentatively, by I. H. Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles* (London: T & T Clark, 1999); from a catholic perspective by L. T. Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy* (New York: Doubleday, 2001).

[34] W. F. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (ET Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971); J. D. G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1977); Schweizer, *Church Order in the New Testament*.

[35] B. Holmberg, *Paul and Power* (Lund: Gleerup, 1978); Judge, *Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century*; Meeks, *First Urban Christians*; N. H. Taylor, *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem: A Study in Relationships and Authority*

figures in the early Christian congregations has increasingly been recognized; whose power derived not so much from pneumatic manifestations or apostolic appointment as from their position in society: wealth, status, and concomitant power.[36] The gradual emergence of the distinct orders of ministry known in Catholic Christianity has continued to be located well after the apostolic period,[37] but the notion of post-apostolic decline was no longer tenable.

The household, which included all variety of retainers, including slaves, freed slaves, employees, and clients as well as extended family, was the foundational unit of ancient society, within which the authority and power of the patron was mitigated only by the complexity of the institution and the limits on communications during that period.[38] Should a householder be converted through the preaching of a Christian missionary, that household became, in effect, a Christian church whose members were converted not through personal conviction but through obedience and obligation.[39] Christian worship, presided over by the patron,[40] replaced the

---

in Earliest Christianity (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992; London: Bloomsbury, 2015); R. L. Wilken, *The Myth of Christian Beginnings* (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980).

[36] Holmberg, *Paul and Power*; Chow, *Patronage and Power*; Meeks, *First Urban Christians*; Taylor, *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem*; Theissen, *Social Setting*.

[37] C. K. Barrett, *Church, Ministry, and Sacraments in the New Testament* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1983); H. C. Kee, *Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980); M. Y. MacDonald, *The Pauline Churches* (Cambridge: CUP, 1988).

[38] P. D. A. Garnsey & R. P. Saller, *The Roman Empire* (London: Duckworth, 1987; R. F. Hock, *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980); R. MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974); R. P. Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (Cambridge: CUP, 1982); cf. G. E. M. de Sainte Croix, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World* (London: Duckworth, 1981).

[39] Gehring, *House Church and Mission*; N. H. Taylor, *Paul on Baptism* (London: SCM, 2016); 'The Social Nature of Conversion in the Early Christian World', pp. 128-36 in *Modelling Early Christianity*, ed. by P. F. Esler (London: Routledge, 1995); cf. E. Adams, *The Earliest Christian Meeting Places* (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016).

[40] Gehring, *House Church and Mission*, pp. 194-95; H.-J. Klauck, _Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum_ (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981); *Herrenmahl under hellenistischer Kult* (Münster: Aschendorf, 1982), pp. 349-50.

daily cults of the family, and embraced others who attached themselves to the local church. Activities which today might be described as 'lay' or diaconal ministry were exercised by members of the household as directed by the patron.[41]

It is clear that congregations were, or rapidly became, more than simply the household at worship. As well as itinerant Christian missionaries and other travellers who might temporarily attach themselves to a Christian congregation, and avail themselves of the hospitality of the householders, cities attracted disparate and displaced individuals who, for whatever reason, had temporarily or permanently lost their roots in the household to which they had belonged. If these were converted, they might have attached themselves to an existing church and household, or perhaps have formed a church of their own, apart from the patronage system of household and city.[42] Churches may also have been formed of more than one household, particularly when a person of wealth and status was able to provide a degree of protection and access to Christian teaching not available to a poorer household.

It is precisely at the point at which a church moves beyond the parameters of the household that the emergence of distinctive, defined, and titled forms of hierarchy and ministry should be sought. The most powerful householder in a city or town, who would almost certainly have hosted gatherings of the church, either in his own home or in a public building rented for the purpose, would at this point have emerged as bishop. This is reflected in the qualifications for the office listed in I Tim 3.1-7 and Tit 1.7-9; irrespective of whether these letters were written by Paul, they provide the earliest references to titled officers with functions and prerequisite qualities in the records of early Christianity.[43] The functions of ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι, and the criteria for office, are essentially identical, essentially that they be householders with sufficient means to discharge the patronage expected of them, honourable by the criteria of Graeco-Roman culture if repressive by contemporary standards, and not recent converts without the competence to teach the faith – in itself an indicator that wealth and status might be construed as sufficient qualification to preside over a

---

[41] Cf. I Cor 16. 15-16. Cf. J. N. Collins, *Deacons and the Church* (Harrisburg: Morehouse, 2002); *Diakonia* (Oxford: OUP, 2009).

[42] Cf. Adams, *Christian Meeting Places*, pp. 137-202.

[43] Phil 1. 1 mentions ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι, but there is no indication in the letter as to who these were, or what functions they discharged. It is plausible that the terms could refer to householders who provided patronage and their retainers who assisted in some way, but this is far from certain.

church. It was assumed that the terms were interchangeable and reflect a collegial form of church leadership, even though ἐπίσκοπος invariably occurs in the singular and πρεσβύτεροι in the plural. A corollary was that episcopacy, as exemplified by the pretensions of Ignatius of Antioch, reflects the emergence to dominance of a single member of a previously egalitarian college of presbyters in a particular place. [44] This reconstruction of the emergence of Church order has been, consciously or otherwise, presupposed in much ecumenical discussion of the past century, the main argument being whether or not this development can be traced to the apostolic Church.[45]

Largely on account of sociologically informed appreciation of the significance of the household in the formation of early Christian communities, this consensus has been challenged, if not reversed. It is now recognized that episcopacy evolved out of the role of a (dominant) householder-patron, whether called bishop or not, and that the collegial oversight of a presbyterate represents a later development.[46] It is not to be supposed that the pattern of development was uniform or simultaneous, even if the general direction of development from the first to the end of the second century is fairly clear.

As the Church grappled with issues of doctrine, and the founding missionaries became a more distant memory, geographical proximity drew hitherto coexisting churches into closer networks, better able to endure the external pressure of intermittent persecutions. In some places, what is sometimes described as a federation of churches formed an umbrella body, consisting largely of the householder-bishops of the various congregations.[47] In others, the household gave way to the voluntary association or the social club as the model for governance of the community, especially when other premises replaced the domestic setting of worship, and a presbyteral form

---

[44] Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*; Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*; cf. M. Zetterholm, *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch* (London: Routledge, 2003). For a Roman Catholic view, R. E. Brown, *Priest and Bishop* (New York: Paulist, 1970).

[45] Cf. World Council of Churches, *Baptism, Eucharist, Ministry* (Geneva: WCC, 1982).

[46] A. L. Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch* (London: T & T Clark, 2009); *The Imperial Cult and the Development of Church Order* (Leiden: Brill, 1999); R. A. Campbell, *The Elders* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994); Stewart, *Original Bishops*; cf. F. A. Sullivan, *From Apostles to Bishops* (New York: Paulist, 2001).

[47] Stewart, *Bishops*; cf. Brent, *Ignatius*; *Imperial Cult*.

of government would have predominated, with members appointed to offices for limited or indefinite periods.[48]

The emergence of a monarchical bishop, with oversight of congregations of potentially quite diverse origin in a particular city, could have been influenced by some variety of factors. The need for unity in the face of persecution could have brought together, or into an enhanced sense of common identity, communities of different ethnic and cultural character, or which had been the fruit of different missionary movements; historical rivalries may have been resolved, reconciling schisms, and natural growth and bifurcation through the conversion of other householders been contained within a single structure. With the emergence of the monarchical bishop, other householder-patrons in the city, who would often have continued to host gatherings of their congregations, might have become presbyters and acquired a role in collegial governance. [49] Recognized Christian teachers and other outstanding individuals such as confessors,[50] who acquired a recognized status and influence apart from the structures of the household, in some places were also included in the presbyterate. The merging of different churches in a locality into a single structure presided over by a monarchical bishop would have reflected a 'demotion' for householders who had previously functioned as undisputed leaders of their congregations. For others, the presbyterate conferred official recognition within church structures for a variety of figures whose positions were becoming marginalized as these structures became entrenched. In the case of more independent figures, incorporation into church structures would have imposed accountability as well as conferring recognition. [51]

---

[48] Cf. Adams, *Christian Meeting Places*; Stewart, *Bishops*.

[49] Cf. Campbell, *Elders*; Stewart, *First Bishops*.

[50] Christians who had been imprisoned and/or tortured during times of persecution and remained faithful, but not been killed, are known to have acquired a status akin to presbyters during the second century, at least in the north African church reflected in the letters of Cyprian of Carthage. Cyprian is concerned, while acknowledging their witness, to circumscribe their arrogating any authority to which they had not been ordained by the bishop, *Epistulae* 10, *Ad Martyres*; 22, *Ad Clerum Romae*; 33, *Ad Clerum et Plebem*; 34, *Ad Clerum et Plebem*.

[51] Disputes about the authority of confessors, and earlier of prophets, in relation to that of leaders whose authority rested on socio-economic power, were recurrent in the church of the first centuries. In sociology the co-option of charismatic and dissident figures into the structure of the organization is sometimes described as 'protest absorption', A. Etzioni, *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations* (New York: Free Press, 1975).

Subordinate members of his household delegated to works of Christian service by the bishop would also have acquired a recognized identity apart from the household, from which the diaconate emerged.[52]

While we should not assume that church formation and governance evolved according to any single or rigid pattern, it is clear that presbyteral church governance represents a later stage in the development of ecclesiastical offices than the householder-bishop. Equally, it is clear that a single bishop gradually emerged to predominance over the household-churches and presbyteries of the cities of the Roman Empire, and remaining householder-bishops were subordinated and became part of the presbytery. We should not assume, however, that bishops were invariably dominant and autocratic; there is evidence also of bishops who were appointed and accountable functionaries of the presbytery, and allegations that some were slaves purchased for the purpose.[53] These processes were fluid, variable, and reversible during the second and third centuries, until from the time of Constantine bishops became increasingly incorporated into the structures of the empire, their power entrenched by that of the emperor, and presbyters firmly and definitively subordinated to them.

---

[52] I Cor 16.15-16 reflects an early example of this, as might I Cor 1.12. It is also possible that this is what Paul seeks in his letter to Philemon, N. H. Taylor, 'Onesimus: A Study in Slavery and Conversion in Early Christianity', *Religion and Theology,* 3 (1996) 159-81.

[53] Stewart, *Bishops.*

Episcopacy in the Reformation

CHARLOTTE METHUEN
Professor of Church History (University of Glasgow)

It is evident unto all men, diligently readinge holye scripture, and auncient aucthours, that from the Apostles tyme, there hathe bene these orders of Ministers in Christes church, Bisshoppes, Priestes, and Deacons, …[1]

In these, the opening words of the preface to the 1550 English ordinal, Thomas Cranmer asserted a historical certainty to the three-fold order of ministry which was far from evident to many of his fellow reformers. Reading the same sources by the early 1540s, as Cranmer presumably knew, Calvin had come to argue for not a three-fold, but a four-fold order of ministry: doctors, or teachers; pastors, or preachers; elders and deacons.[2] Luther's view of orders was much more fluid: having made the case in 1520 that ordination was not a sacrament, he was nonetheless convinced of the need for an ordered and authorized ministry, but he was less concerned about what form that ministry should take. It is clear, however, that Lutherans did not assert the three-fold ministry as scripturally and historically self-evident, and this must have been clear to Cranmer when he was writing the preface to the Ordinal. He had, after all, been fully immersed in the Reformation in Nuremberg in the early 1530s and was familiar with Lutheran theology and ministry.

Nonetheless, over the course of the Reformation, and despite the rejection of bishops during Oliver Cromwell's Protectorate in the mid-seventeenth century, the Church of England retained episcopal order, setting a precedent which would fundamentally shape Anglicanism. Post-Reformation Lutheran churches, in contrast, did not all implement the same form of polity. Whereas in the Nordic and Scandinavian context, structures of bishops in dioceses were retained, many of the German lands witnessed to the emergence of Lutheran church structures in which territorial rulers often exercised a '*Summepiskopat'*. Such forms have generally been rejected by Anglicans as standing outside the 'historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples', laid down in the Lambeth Quadrilateral as the fourth fundamental

---

[1] The 1550 ordinal may be found online at http://www.justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1549/Deacons_1549.htm.
[2] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* IV.3.5 and IV.3.8.

for 'church reunion'.[3] However, a closer examination of the circumstances in which reformation forms of leadership emerged suggests that the relationship between temporal and spiritual powers in the Late Middle Ages shaped what structures proved feasible at the introduction of the Reformation. Moreover, different challenges accompanied the reformation of a national church in contrast to the church of a geographically smaller territory. This paper aims to shed light on the different forms taken in the early modern period by 'the historic episcopate, locally adapted'. It does so by offering a consideration of the reforms undertaken in the ordering of the English church under and by Henry VIII (and, briefly, under his successors) and exploring them in the context of what was happening at a similar period in Saxony and other territories in the Holy Roman Empire which introduced the Reformation. It will conclude by reflecting on how these observations might shed light on the polity of the Scottish churches.

Bishops in the late-medieval church in England and the German territories
In approaching this question, it is instructive to consider the very different ecclesiastical and political contexts of the late-medieval Holy Roman Empire in comparison with those of first England and then Scotland. Reformation church order built on – or reacted to – the structures of the medieval church. In the German lands, the birthplace of the Reformation, these were distinctive. Here, as nowhere else in the Western Church, bishops were prince-bishops:[4] their spiritual jurisdictions extended over the territories of other princes, but they also exercised civic jurisdiction which placed them not only on a par with their secular counterparts, but often in direct competition with them. Although nominally subject to imperial and papal power, most German bishops were elected by cathedral chapters which were firmly in the hands of noble families who took it in turns to nominate a candidate for office.[5]

---

[3] The Lambeth Quadrilateral was Resolution 11 of the 1888 Lambeth Conference [online at: https://www.anglicancommunion.org/resources/document-library/lambeth-conference/1888/resolution-11?author=Lambeth+Conference&year=1888)].

[4] German bishops were listed under *principi* in the Vatican filing system, whilst English (and presumably also Scottish) bishops were listed under *vescovi*: Hans-Jürgen Brandt, 'Furstbischof und Weihbischof im Spätmittelalter. Zur Darstellung der *sacri ministerii summa* des reichskirchlichen Episkopats', p. 1.

[5] For further details of the German aspects of what follows, see Charlotte Methuen, 'The German Catholic Dioceses and their Bishops on the Eve of the

In England, in contrast, although bishops often had high political status, their dioceses fell within the jurisdiction of the monarch to whom bishops were subject. Elections of bishops were nominally conducted by cathedral chapters, but this process was largely a formality: the king normally indicated his choice to the chapter by means of a *congé d'élire*; the chapter elected the named candidate, and the bishop-elect was then commended to the pope.[6] As in the German lands, the sees of English bishops included temporal estates which the bishops held on the same basis as lay lords,[7] and English bishops were, as Felicity Heal puts it, 'spiritual noblemen'.[8] However, an English bishop owed a strong allegiance to the king, who had either recommended him for office or actively agreed to his appointment.[9] Moreover, English bishops were integrated into the national structures of governance: they sat in the House of Lords, and Thomas Wolsey, appointed Archbishop of York in 1514, was also Lord Chancellor of England from 1515. English bishops were integrated into a national political hierarchy headed by the king.

This was quite different from the situation of the German princes and city councils, who often found themselves in political conflict with the local bishop and his territorial interests. When German rulers moved to introduce the Reformation into their territories, therefore, they often needed to act against a neighbouring ecclesiastico-political power. In England, in contrast, when the king moved to assert his authority over the church and deny that of the pope, and claimed the right, amongst others, to appoint bishops directly and without reference to the papacy or any other foreign power, he was, as Carleton recognizes 'abrogating to himself a jurisdiction which for many years had *de facto* been exercised by the crown; the claim was for the *de jure* right to exercise that appointing power'.[10] Here too the contrast to the German situation is apparent. The Duke of Jülich and Berg, for instance, had in the late-fifteenth century sought to strengthen his authority over the church in his territory, rejecting the authority of the Archbishop of Cologne

---

Reformation', in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Martin Luther*, ed. by Derek R. Nelson and Paul R. Hinlicky (Oxford Research Encyclopedias – Religion; New York: OUP), vol. 1, pp. 521-38 [online at: doi:10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.013.275].

[6] Kenneth Carleton, *Bishops and Reform in the English Church, 1520-1559* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001), p. 7.

[7] Ibid., p. 8.

[8] Felicity Heal, *Of Prelates and Princes: A study of the economic and social position of the Tudor episcopate* (Cambridge: CUP, 1980), p. 20.

[9] Carleton, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-8.

[10] Ibid., p. 7.

as a 'foreign power' and introducing the office of '*Landesdechant*' (Territorial Dean) appointed by the Duke himself.[11] In Jülich, the Archbishop of Cologne was the 'foreign power', while in the English context that role would be reserved for the pope: the bishops, although they needed, in Henry's eyes, to be brought under his authority, were integrated into a political system which had mechanisms by which this could be done.

Henry VIII and the episcopate

There are good reasons, therefore, to see the continuation of the episcopal structure in the English church as related to the national scale of its reformation. Significantly, as Heal points out, 'the structure of the church over which [the bishops] presided was relatively well integrated into the English commonwealth'[12] This proved an important factor in the English Reformation, for if what was wanted was a reformed church to serve the whole of England, then structures were needed that extended across the country, linking parishes into a united organization; this was precisely what the medieval system of parishes, dioceses and provinces offered. Nonetheless, the transition was not seamless, and there are indications that the place of bishops in the church created by Henry VIII's break from Rome was not entirely assured. Henry VIII (or perhaps John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester from 1505-1535, or Thomas More) defended the role of bishops in his *Assertio septem sacramentorum*, written against Luther in 1521.[13] However, the position of English bishops in the 1530s suggests the English bishops saw their position as less assured than it looks in hindsight. In September 1530, the king was asserted by the Dukes of Suffolk and Norfolk to be 'absolute both as emperor and pope in his own kingdom',[14] and this principle underlay the series of parliamentary acts through which Henry took control of the English Church: the Act for the Pardon of the Clergy (1531), the Act of Restraint of Appeals (1533) and the Act of Supremacy

---

[11]Antje Flüchter, *Der Zölibat zwischen Devianz und Norm: Kirchenpolitik und Gemeindealltag in den Herzogtümern Jülich und Berg im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Köln: Böhlau, 2006), p. 96.

[12]Heal, *op. cit.*, p. 19. In making this comment, Heal contrasts the situation of bishops in England to that in Scandinavia, where 'the bishops posed the major threat to the crown' and suggests that in Scotland the situation was one of competition between nobles and bishops.

[13] See Martin Krarup, *Ordination in Wittenberg: die Einsetzung in das kirchliche Amt in Kursachsen zur Zeit der Reformation* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), p. 32.

[14]Malcolm B. Yarnell III, *Royal priesthood in the English reformation* (Oxford: OUP, 2013), p. 127.

(1534). [15] The king's headship over the church included, as the Act of Supremacy declared, not only 'matters of jurisdiction and administration', but also doctrine and the interpretation of Scripture.[16] In 1535, the English bishops were required to petition Henry for reappointment to their sees and for the right to perform episcopal functions including ordinations, visitations and the granting of probate, and in 1536, Henry appointed Thomas Cromwell, a layman, to be Vicar-General and Vicegerent of the King in matters spiritual.[17] This appointment, taken together with the dissolution of the monasteries and the secularization of much ecclesiastical property, some of which had belonged to bishops, suggests that at the time it cannot have been clear that the process of secularization would not become even more radical to the extent of transferring episcopal functions to laymen.[18] If Thomas Cromwell could be made vicegerent in spiritual matters, why could this principle not extend to the appointment of bishops? There were precedents, criticized by those who called for church reform, of late-medieval bishops who had been consecrated long after they had taken up their responsibilities, or not at all. Although bishops were retained, by the early 1540s, episcopal jurisdiction was asserted to be exercised 'by virtue only of the King's supremacy and at his good pleasure', and bishops' authority to carry out diocesan visitations (through which they were to support the supremacy) was given to them 'of God and the King'.[19] The effect, as Carleton asserts, was that 'by the end of the 1530s, the bishops had become entirely dependent on the king for the exercise of their power'.[20] Moreover, suggests Yarnell, the bishops justifiably feared that the ordained ministry might disappear altogether: 'The dissolution of the monasteries and the radical threats in Parliament called into question the need for the clergy. ... The ministry was under siege from king and laity.'[21]

That not all English bishops saw this situation positively is scarcely surprising. Reform was recognized to be necessary, and the revised canons proposed by the Convocation of Canterbury in conjunction with the Reform Parliament in 1529 had called for reform of the church, including the role of the bishops, and required bishops 'diligently [to] carry out the things ...

---

[15]Carleton, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.
[16]Ibid., p. 13; cf. 'The Act of Supremacy, 1534', in *Documents of the English Reformation*, ed. by Gerald Bray (Cambridge: James Clarke, corrected edition 2004), pp. 113-114.
[17]Carleton, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
[18]Heal, *op. cit.*, pp. 104, 107.
[19]Carleton, *op. cit.*, pp. 14, 16.
[20]Ibid., p. 15.
[21]Yarnell, *op. cit.*, pp. 181.

which pertain to their office'.[22] By the late 1530s, Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of Durham and John Stokesley, Bishop of London, were arguing that the principal duty of the secular ruler is 'to defend the faith of Christ and his religion, maintain true doctrine, abolish abuses, heresies, idolatries, to oversee priests and bishops in exercising their power, office and jurisdiction faithfully'. The king, they thought, should be excluded from holding a preaching or sacramental function, and ecclesiastical office holders should be excluded from temporal power, except as delegated by secular ruler.[23] Tunstall and Stokesley's position chimed with the terms of the Act of Supremacy, whilst trying to maintain and define the bishops' authority. Edward Foxe, appointed Bishop of Hereford in 1535, argues that the king holds 'the supreme authority of spiritual and temporal things'. He 'makes', 'ordains', and 'consecrates' bishops, whose office is 'to pray and preach the word of God, and to offer gifts and sacrifices for sin'. Bishops cannot claim the temporal sword and must obey their prince.[24] Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester from 1531, argued that the king, as supreme head of the realm, must also be supreme head of the church in England, since the people concerned 'is one and the same congregation': he has a God-given responsibility for spiritual and eternal affairs which he exercises through the hierarchy of 'the very real degrees of clergy—archbishop, bishop and curate', also divinely instituted, who 'cooperate in the offices of teaching and ministry of the sacraments'. [25] Gardiner's position, as Yarnell observes, 'offered a constitutional arrangement for increasing the power of prelates over the lower clergy and the laity. … King and bishop are united in a rigid ecclesiocracy'.[26] In contrast, in 1537, eight bishops at the London Synod issued a 'Judgement of some Bishops' which argued that 'kings have a general charge but not a sacerdotal cure', and that 'bishops and priests … are to teach and determine doctrine, and loosen [*sic*!] and bind sin.' Moreover, in the view of the bishops, 'Kings are subject to them in these matters. On their part, kings are to ensure that bishops and priests do their duty.'[27]

---

[22] *The Anglican Canons, 1529-1947, ed. by* Gerald Bray (Church of England Record Society 6; Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998), pp. 2/3 (the Latin text is given on the even pages; the English translation on the odd).
[23] Carleton, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-17.
[24] Yarnell, *op. cit.*, pp. 166-67.
[25] Ibid., pp. 167-69.
[26] Ibid., p. 169.
[27] Ibid., p. 181.

Ministries of oversight in the German Reformation
Followers of the Reformation elsewhere, in contrast, were questioning whether the church needed an ordained ministry at all, let alone an episcopally ordained ministry. Tyndale's English translation of the New Testament, which had rendered Greek *presbyteros* as 'elder', who was 'nothing but an officer to teach', should not be understood as a mediator between God and other Christians, and did not need episcopal ordination.[28] Similarly, Krarup argues that Luther and Melanchthon did not believe ordination to be always necessary for the celebrant at the Lord's Supper.[29] Within German evangelical territories, the consensus that an authorized ministry was necessary had been articulated in the 1530 Augsburg Confession, which asserted: 'Of Ecclesiastical Order they teach that no one should publicly teach in the Church or administer the Sacraments unless he be regularly called.'[30] However, agreement over the proper liturgical form for evangelical ordination, was only beginning to emerge in the mid-1530s, and the question of who should ordain was a part of this discussion.[31] Luther had argued in 1520 that a bishop ordained on behalf of the wider church: 'in the place and stead of the whole community, all of whom have like power, he [the bishop] takes a person and charges him to exercise this power on behalf of the others.'[32] In 1523, when he was consulted about the possibility of establishing an evangelical bishopric in Bohemia, Luther advised that such a bishop should take overall responsibility for the leadership of the church leadership and should lead visitations, but did not identify ordinations specifically as part of the bishop's responsibility.[33] In the visitation order for Saxony, the *Unterricht der Visitatoren*, in contrast, the Wittenberg Reformers identified the original responsibilities of a bishop as the examination and ordination of the clergy, oversight over church courts, the organization of synods, and oversight of schools, universities and all who worked in them or

---

[28]Ibid., pp. 169-70.

[29]Krarup, o*p. cit.,* pp. 120-21.

[30]   Augsburg   Confession,   Article   XIV   [online   at: http://bookofconcord.org/augsburgconfession.php#article14].

[31]Thus, Smith, *Luther, Ministry and Ordination Rites*, identifies 1525-1535 as a 'decade of transition' for Lutheran ordination rites and practices, and 1535-1570 – long after Luther's death – as a period of 'emerging consensus' (titles of chapters 3 and 4).

[32]Martin Luther, *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation*, WA 6, 407; LW 44, 128.

[33]Krarup, op. cit., pp. 65-66.

served the church. [34] These responsibilities must be fulfilled, and if they were not properly exercised by the bishop then someone else must be appointed to do so. Ensuring continued oversight of the church in the German territories was a priority, but this might not be through bishops.

However, here again the complexity of the German jurisdictions and their difference to the English situation becomes clear. In authorizing the 1528 visitation of the Saxon churches, Elector Johannes Friedrich was appropriating the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Brandenburg over the Saxon churches, a transfer of authority which had been taking place with respect to Wittenberg since at least the turn of the sixteenth century.[35]In order to maintain order with the Saxon church, superintendents were appointed, who had a regional jurisdiction which was subordinate to that of the Elector. Luther held that bishops should more properly be understood in terms of their responsibilities as 'inspectors or visitors',[36] quite likely drawing on Augustine's explanation that the most appropriate Latin translation of the Greek term *episcopos* was superintendent.[37] For political reasons the new areas of jurisdiction in the German lands were generally defined within territorial boundaries, and therefore differed significantly from the

---

[34] Arne Butt, '"Wir sehen nicht gerne Unordnung". Protestantische Kirchenleitungsmodelle und Ordnungsprinzipien on Konsistorialordnungen des 16. Jahrhunderts', in *Gute Ordnung. Ordnungsmodelle und Ordnungsvorstellungen in der Reformationszeit,* ed. by Irene Dingel and Armin Kohnle (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2014), pp. 49-64, here 53; for the process of drafting the *Unterricht der Visitatoren*, see Stefan Michel, '"Der Unterricht der Visitatoren" (1528. Die erste Kirchenordnung der von Wittenberg ausgehenden Reformation?' in *Gute Ordnung*, ed. by Dingel and Kohnle, pp. 153-67.

[35]As argued in Natalie Krentz, *Ritualwandel und Deutungshoheit. Die frühe Reformation in der Residenzstadt Wittenberg (1500–1533)* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014); compare eadem, 'The Making of the Reformation: The Early Urban Reformation Between Continuity and Change', *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 19 (2017), 30-49.

[36]Martin Luther, 'Lectures on Titus', in *D. Martin Luthers Werke* (Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1902), vol. 25, p. 17; *Luther's Works* (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House 1968), vol. 29, p. 17.

[37]Augustine writes, 'For thus a higher place is accorded to bishops, so that they direct and, as it were, take care of the people. For what is called *episcopos* in Greek is translated in Latin as superintendent, because he directs, because he oversees': Commentary on Psalm 126, par. 3 (*Patrologia Latina* 37, 1669). I am grateful to Timothy Wengert for this reference.

geographical boundaries of the medieval dioceses.[38] However, the pattern of a German prince overseeing a church by means of superintendents which emerged in most Protestant territories during the 1530s was broadly similar to the pattern of the English king overseeing the church by means of bishops which by 1540 was being confirmed as the shape of the Henrician church. The geographical continuities in England, in contrast to Germany, meant that many bishops presided over dioceses which were contiguous with medieval boundaries; they were enthroned in cathedrals and presided over cathedral chapters as their medieval predecessors had done. The new dioceses that were founded after the dissolution of the monasteries, often to preserve abbey churches with royal connections and elevate them to cathedral status, mirrored these medieval structures. They too had cathedral churches with cathedral chapters, although the legal and constitutional status of the new dioceses – and indeed of all those English dioceses whose cathedral churches had until the early 1540s been monastic foundations – was not entirely clear, and would not become so until the reign of Mary I.[39]

Bishops in the Henrician church were clearly expected to enforce the ecclesiastical changes introduced by king and parliament.[40] However, the retention of bishops does not seem to have been a key reason why Luther and his followers were suspicious of the English developments; this question certainly did not emerge as a key issue in the long negotiations in the spring of 1538.[41] Similarly, when Bucer wrote to Cranmer regarding the English Reformation, he made proposals which took account of the episcopal

---

[38]This was not always the case, as when Nikolaus Amsdorff was 'ordiniert und eingeweiht' as Bishop of Naumburg in 1542. See Peter Brunner, *Nikolaus von Amsdorf als Bischof von Naumburg* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1961).

[39]The dioceses founded by Henry VIII were: Westminster (17 December 1540), with Westminster Abbey as its cathedral; Chester (4 August 1541); Gloucester (3 September 1541); Peterborough (4 September 1541); Bristol (4 June 1542); and Oxford (1 September 1542).

[40]Heal, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

[41]See, for instance, Rory McEntegart, *Henry VIII, the League of Schmalkalden, and the English Reformation* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), pp. 55-60. Compare also the letter of Antony Musa to Stephen Rothe, 16 January 1536: *Corpus Reformatorum* (Halle: C. A. Schwetschke, 1836), vol. 3, col. 12-14 (no. 1389); *Letters and papers, foreign and domestic, of the reign of Henry VIII: preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and elsewhere* (London, HM Stationery Office, 1887), vol. 10, 38-39 (no. 112) [online at: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8].

structure of the Church.[42] Bucer believed that overseers, pastors, elders and deacons were all necessary offices to fulfil the ministry of the church, and he seems to have understood England's bishops as fulfilling the role of overseer. [43] What was important to the German reformers, as they emphasized when defining the church in the Augsburg Confession, was that the true gospel be preached and the sacraments properly administered.[44] Increasingly, they recognized that structures needed to be defined in order that this happen, but were unconcerned about what shape those structures took.

The English episcopate reformed
Under Henry VIII, then, the monarch had become responsible for maintenance and continuation of ministry in the realm,[45] and this situation continued under his son Edward VI. On Edward's accession, as after the Act of Supremacy, the bishops were required to petition for licences to exercise office.[46] In 1547, the bishops' visitation rights were removed and ordinary episcopal jurisdiction suspended; [47] although bishops were subsequently given authority to carry out visitations, they received this in their capacity as royal commissioners.[48] From 1548, licences to preach could be issued only by the king.[49] The practical dependence of bishops in the king was not, however, evident from the ordinal of 1550, which made no mention of the king except in the requirement that each ordinand swear an oath recognizing the king's supremacy, and in the inclusion in the consecration service of bishops and archbishops of the reading of the king's mandate for their consecration.[50] The ordinal also, as observed at the outset of this paper, affirmed the three-fold ministry, which Cranmer must have known was not the pattern of ministry used in other reformed territories. Diarmaid MacCulloch suggests that Cranmer's assertion may have been a strategy to win approval for the revised ordinal from the more conservative bishops,

---

[42]Willem van 't Spijker, *The Ecclesiastical Offices in the Thought of Martin Bucer* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), p. 387, citing Bucer's correspondence with Farel and Calvin.
[43]Ibid., pp. 387, 389.
[44]   Augsburg   Confession,   Article   VII   [online   at: http://bookofconcord.org/augsburgconfession.php#article7].
[45]Carleton, *op. cit.*, p. 24.
[46]Ibid.; Heal, *op. cit.*, p. 126.
[47]Heal, *op. cit.*, p. 127-28.
[48]Carleton, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-25.
[49]Ibid., p. 25.
[50]Ibid.

similar to the addition of 'commonly called the Mass' to the title of the Lord's Supper in the 1549 Book of Common Prayer, which had helped it to pass the Lords.[51] It may also have been intended as reassurance to the imperial ambassador: Heal believes that the need to appease the Emperor to some extent restrained moves to appropriate episcopal wealth and reconfigure the bishop as 'a preaching supervisor, supported by an appropriate "competent maintenance"'.[52] Edward VI's death interrupted this process of re-visioning the English episcopate.

During the reign of Edward's Catholic half-sister, Mary, bishops although now again looking to Rome, did not generally exercise secular functions. This was a reforming Catholic episcopate. Mary appointed as bishops theologically educated men, rather than lawyers or diplomats, and the expectation of both Mary and her Archbishop of Canterbury, Reginald Pole, was that the bishops would play a key role in the task of restoring the church. Accordingly, Pole exhorted the bishops to 'rectify their non-residency and preach the gospel to the flocks they should love'.[53] Improved diocesan structures were central to this concept: cathedrals were to be 'exemplars of good practice and centres of orthodox spiritual life'.[54] Under Pole, diocesan seminaries were established; he sought to regulate diocesan finances and the Diocese of Durham received new statutes.[55] By Mary's death, Loades observes, her bishops 'had done much to put the affairs of their dioceses in order and to restore a measure of respect for the

[51] Diarmaid MacCulloch to Charlotte Methuen, private communication 20 May 2016.

[52] Heal, *op. cit.*, pp. 128-30.

[53] Yarnell, *op. cit.*, p. 260. Pole believed that the bishops had a responsibility not only to reform the clergy, but also to influence and reform the papacy when needed: the pope's office, he taught, 'must be carried out in the midst of the bishops, for all bishops share equally in the succession, and papal inerrancy "inhered in the college of cardinals, not the pope".' Ibid., pp. 258-69.

[54] David Loades, *Tudor government: structures of authority in the sixteenth century* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), pp. 181-82. Compare also David Loades, 'The Marian Episcopate', in *The Church of Mary Tudor, ed. by* Eamon Duffy and David Loades, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 40, 55; Eamon Duffy, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England under Mary Tudor* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), pp. 23-25.

[55] Duffy, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-28; Loades, *op. cit.*, pp. 181-83; Thomas F. Mayer, 'The success of Cardinal Pole's final legation', in Duffy and Loades, *op. cit.*, pp. 149-75.

episcopacy'.[56] These diocesan reforms would prove invaluable when Elizabeth ascended to the throne, and it is entirely plausible that, as Loades suggested, it was Mary's reign that preserved episcopacy in England.[57]

However, the re-catholicization of England and the persecution of Protestants during Mary's reign also prompted the development of a more radical approach to church order. Heal believes that it was in 1554 that the question of the abolition of the episcopacy first began to be explored seriously in England,[58] and Yarnell notes that 'among the exiles, self-government became a way of life', with some, including the future Archbishop of York, Edwin Sandys, 'having experienced and approved congregational self-government', and specifically 'congregational election and discipline of ministers'.[59] By the mid-sixteenth century, Calvin's reflections on the role of bishops and his advocacy of a four-fold ministry of doctors (i.e. teachers), preachers, elders and deacons had begun to emerge as an alternative way of thinking about church order. Some English divines, particularly those exiled and living in German or Swiss churches, began to consider whether the church might not be better off without bishops at all.[60] This too was a legacy bequeathed by the Marian restoration to the Elizabethan church.

Bishops under Elizabeth I
In the reign of Elizabeth deep conflicts about the retention of episcopacy in the English church began to surface. Brett Usher argues convincingly that 'there must be a very strong presumption' that in the first eleven months of Elizabeth's reign William Cecil, her main adviser at this period, was in favour of the reforms which would have transformed bishops from prelates who drew incomes from their own estates into 'superintendents' with fixed

---

[56]David Loades, *Politics, censorship and the English Reformation* (London: Pinter, 1991), p. 197.

[57]Ibid.; compare C. S. Knighton, 'Westminster Abbey Restored', in: Duffy and Loades, *op. cit.*, pp. 77-123, at 105.

[58]Heal, *op. cit.,* p. 144.

[59]Yarnell, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

[60] Brett Usher cites the example of the London Protestant congregation which under Mary ordained its own minister without episcopal involvement, noting that the Elizabethan bishop of London, Matthew Grindal retrospectively 'approved, ratified, authorized and confirmed' this minister's ordination. Brett Usher, '"In time of persecution": New light on the secret Protestant Congregation in Marian London', in *John Foxe and the English Reformation,* ed. by David Loades (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997), pp. 233-51, at 234.

salaries.[61] However, Elizabeth herself 'held grimly and tenaciously' to the principle of *cuius regio, eius religio*, and '[refused] to countenance any fundamental alteration of the episcopal order'.[62] The 1559 Settlement re-established the controls over the English bishops (and indeed all clergy) which had been put in place under Henry VIII; it reinstated the formal expectation that the bishop be appointed by the cathedral chapter, although in practice a royal mandate commanding the chapter to elect the candidate of the Queen's choice was sent to the chapter.[63] At the same time, through the Act of Exchange, appropriations of land and assets from the bishops and dioceses continued.[64] Elizabethan bishops, although they continued to be 'members of the House of Lords, possessors for life of landed estates, and prominent leaders – moral, judicial, financial and military – of provincial society', [65] found their power base significantly eroded. This left the episcopate with a problem: 'the crown was expecting its senior clerics to discharge their secular duties as effectively as they had done before the Reformation, but … it failed to offer them the support which would have given them the authority and enthusiasm to fulfil those duties.'[66] Moreover, many of the Elizabethan bishops did not view these secular responsibilities as proper to the episcopal office, and some of the bishops appointed by this state system understood their role in ways which stood in tension with the queen's view of their function. Whitgift, for instance, 're-oriented episcopal authority, intending to align English episcopacy with Calvin's own views on polity and ecclesiastical authority'.[67] The episcopate in England at the end of the sixteenth century was very different from that which had existed at the beginning of the century.

The Scottish church and episcopacy
Ten years after Cranmer drafted the English ordinal, the Reformation was introduced in Scotland. Looking back, Mullan observes, Knox in his *History of the Reformation* presented bishops with 'a menacing visage', as 'idle,

---

[61]Brett Usher, *William Cecil and episcopacy, 1559-1577* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 14-15.

[62]Ibid., pp. 4, 182.

[63]Heal, *op. cit.*, p. 205; for the practice, see Usher, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

[64]Heal, *op. cit.*, pp. 204-10; Usher, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-14.

[65]Usher, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

[66]Heal, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

[67] Marcus K. Harmes, 'Calvin and the English Episcopate, 1580-1610', *Anglican and Episcopal History,* 81 (2012), 22-46 (31).

immoral, avaricious, and persecuting'.[68] In practice however, there were in Scotland, as in England, bishops who embraced the Reformation and sought to implement it in their dioceses.[69] Initially Scotland's *First Book of Discipline* (1560) envisaged national church structures which centred on a form of reformed episcopate: locally elected superintendents were to replace bishops in overseeing the Scottish dioceses, preaching regularly and diligent in visiting the parishes.[70] However, this structure proved complex: bishops continued to exist alongside superintendents and to draw their revenues; power over the appointment of superintendents proved tempting to nobility and to the monarch, and some superintendents were attracted to the trappings of high office, so that, as Mullan comments, 'the common member of the kirk could be excused for failing to observe any significant difference between old bishop and new superintendent.' [71] The *Second Book of Discipline*, drafted in 1578 and endorsed by the Church of Scotland's General Assembly in 1581, condemned all forms of episcopacy, and replaced both bishops and superintendents by presbyteries.[72] Presbyterian church order in Scotland represented an application of Calvin's principles to a national sphere in which the status of the late-medieval church was contested and its bishops were far less integrated into structures of governance than their English counterparts. [73] Questions of Scottish church order would prove highly controversial, in part because the rejection of bishops was also a

---

[68]David George Mullan, *Episcopacy in Scotland: the history of an idea, 1560-1638* (Edinburgh: Donald, 1986), pp. 10, 12.

[69] See Gordon Donaldson, *Reformed by bishops: Galloway, Orkney and Caithness* (Edinburgh: Edina Press, 1987).

[70]The Head, or chapter, 'Of the Superintendents' follows the Fourth Head, 'Concerning Ministers and their Lawful Election', in *The First Book of Discipline*, ed. by James K. Cameron (Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, 1972), pp. 115-28. See also Mullan, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-32.

[71]Mullan, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

[72] These structures are described in chapter VII, 'Of Elderschipis, and Assemblies and of Discipline', in *The Second Book of Discipline*, ed. by James Kirk (Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, 1980), pp. 195-206; compare Mullan, *op. cit.*, pp. 50-52.

[73] See, for instance, Jane Dawson, *Scotland Re-Formed, 1488-1587* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), especially pp. 17-20, 184-86; Alec Ryrie, *The Origins of the Scottish Reformation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), especially pp. 14-16, 97-98, 103-04. For relations between England and Scotland see also Claire Kellar, *Scotland, England, and the Reformation, 1534-61* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003).

rejection of the king's right to exercise authority over the church.[74] Both James VI and Charles I sought to introduce bishops into the Presbyterian system. The civil war that erupted across England and Scotland, Wales and Ireland in the 1640s was caused in large part by conflicts centred on precisely these questions of polity: was church order in England and in Scotland – from 1603 two countries under one crown – to be episcopal or Presbyterian? Over the course of the seventeenth-century, in both Scotland and England, the organization of the national churches and the exercise of authority would take a variety of forms, some with bishops, others without. After 1660, the restoration introduced episcopal churches in both Scotland and England in a context in which, as Marcus Harmes argues, 'the reformation of the episcopate [that is, as undertaken under the Tudor monarchs] functioned as a legitimating agent for episcopal authority.'[75] It was not until 1690 that the Church of Scotland was finally defined to be Presbyterian, and bishops excluded, leaving the legal status of the Episcopal Church in Scotland disputed into the nineteenth century. Whilst in Germany and Switzerland, the heftiest theological disputes centred on questions such as the Eucharist, in England and Scotland wars were fought over polity and the retention or abolition of bishops.

Conclusions

This paper has suggested that light can be shed on the varying polities of the Reformation churches, and particularly their respective political theologies, by considering these against the backdrop of pre-Reformation patterns of relationships between bishops and territorial rulers. The situation and status of a bishop in England and his relationship to the king of England was quite different from the situation or status of a bishop in the German lands, and his relationship to the local lords and princes. The implementing of the Reformation in a territory which lay within a diocese or one which straddled two or more diocesan boundaries was a quite different proposition from the challenges posed by implementing the Reformation into a country in which the bishops were – at least to some extent – subjects of the king. The example of Scotland shows how the Reformation might also be introduced into a nation in such a way as to redefine the relationship between church, nation and king. All these developments – the reformed English episcopate, Scottish presbyterian structures, and German superintendents who reported to their prince, who exercised a very similar role to that held by the German prince

---

[74]Mullan, *op. cit.*, pp. 195-96.
[75] Marcus Harmes, 'The restoration of the episcopate and the English Reformation', *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church,* 12 (2012), 27-43 (27).

bishops – were intended to provide ways of exercising oversight whilst correcting what were seen as the problems of episcopacy as practised in the late-medieval period. The Council of Trent, particularly the third phase in 1561-63, also reformed the Catholic episcopate. Arguably, all these different structures that emerge in different contexts in the Reformation could legitimately be viewed as 'the historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples'.

Scottish Bishops

ALISTAIR MASON
Initial Ministerial Formation Coordinator for the
Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney

Aberdeen, Argyll, Brechin, Caithness, Dunblane, Dunkeld, Edinburgh, Galloway, Glasgow, the Isles, Moray, Orkney, Ross, St Andrews: these are the fourteen names, thirteen of them medieval or earlier, one seventeenth century, that give the titles to our Scottish Episcopal Church (SEC) bishops. We are a territorial church. In much of Christendom, the names are names of cities, and there is a sense that a proper city should have its cathedral. And cathedrals indeed sometimes feel a better selling point for episcopacy than bishops. Not that provosts, or English deans, have the edge over bishops, but the great buildings and what goes on in them, can catch the imagination. In Scotland some of our ancient cathedrals were in villages, and half of the bishops took their title from the whole district: Argyll, Caithness, Galloway, the Isles, Moray, Orkney and Ross. Let us keep it that way – I would not relish having bishops of Inverness and Oban instead. The Church of Scotland has rationalized away its Synods, which were roughly equivalent to our dioceses, and their direct descendants. I miss the highland Synod of Glenelg – imagine being Bishop of Glenelg in a united church.

The attempt to be territorial is a worthwhile one. We should have a sense of place. The clue from the Middle Ages, that a diocese need not just be a city and its hinterland, is worth following up. I live in what was one of Scotland's small counties that was tidied away in a local government reform, and I frequently rehearse the arguments for having a variety of size in local government units. A small county can be experimental in different ways than a large one. The same is true of dioceses. And heaven preserve us from the bloated norms of English dioceses, as if everything depended on a bishop being able to keep the same standard of pomp as an earl. It would not be total nonsense simply to say that we are the heirs of fourteen good old dioceses – and restore the lot. Let us have fourteen bishops. I am not asking for archbishops, who are something of a luxury. In an ecumenical age, our new bishops could probably have as much use of the relevant ancient cathedrals as they needed. It would somewhat swing the balance in the church towards rural concerns, which is not a bad idea. And it might well be that we could honour some really wonderful people who might be a risk in a larger diocese because they have no talent for administration. In the good old / bad old days, the other bishops over-ruled their sensible Primus, John

Skinner, and consecrated the scholar and saint Alexander Jolly as Bishop of Moray. The bishop was a recluse. You had to know where his housekeeper lived, because he never answered the door. In forty years as bishop he never lived in his diocese, never held a diocesan synod – he did not approve of synods – never issued an episcopal charge, and his four clergy and their people loved him dearly. That is what you can do with a numerically very small diocese and a differently-gifted bishop.

Let uss not quite lose the territorial point. You can draw on a map the official boundaries between Scottish Episcopal parishes. In a real parish every living soul is within practical walking distance of the church. Even the Church of Scotland at its best scarcely managed that in the highlands, and our boundaries are laughable. Many rural Episcopalians have to drive miles to their own church, or, if they live in a city, the chances are they choose to drive miles to the church of their choice, past other Episcopal churches. So the realness of the role of parish priest is somewhat shadowy. The priest tends his gathered flock and is known to several of his neighbours. This is a characteristic and familiar failure of a church that once was the national church and remembers its duty. The awful possibility is that we could opt for the gathered flock, somehow discover that this is God's choice, that little congregations are self-evidently condemned, and that there are wonderful techniques out there of management and marketing, and I rather think music-making, that will fill buildings and pay for them too. The map of the new Church of England diocese of Maidstone, designed to provide a fitting bishop for gathered flocks throughout England, is so far thinly dispersed. Still, here in the Scottish Episcopal Church, we have the ghost of a parish system, with territorial parishes grouped in dioceses. Even if the parish priest can only cover a corner of his or her allotted territory, his or her bishop has the cure of souls of several counties and makes the claim to be the bishop of that place.

Our church, after some fretful episcopal elections, is thinking about changing the canon on how to choose bishops. Looking back on the past, it is possible to see patterns in choices that seem very human, and one just hopes that the Lord over-ruled them for good. David Bertie has this lovely new book *The Heraldry of the Bishops of Scotland.*[1] Most medieval bishops seem to have been chosen because of their aristocratic connections. (In eighteenth-century Austria, every bishop had to have the complete 32 noble quarters in his coat of arms.) In Scotland, bishops carried on having connections to gentry, or at least close family relations to other bishops, after

---

[1] David M. Bertie, *The Heraldry of the Bishops of Scotland*, illustrated by John Hamilton Gaylor (Edinburgh: Heraldic Society of Scotland, 2018).

the Reformation and on to the nineteenth century. Then there were the days when the question asked was 'Does he have private means?' because the poor Scottish Episcopal Church could not pay a stipend for a bishop. And sometimes one thinks that county gentry had too much of a say in the choice. There was a bishop whose 'parochial' experience had been several years spent as summer chaplain at Braemar and winter chaplain at Cannes. I used to think the twentieth-century Church of England chose too many headmasters of public schools. The Scottish Episcopal Church chose at least two. Bishop Wilkinson of St Andrew's once observed that all the young people of his diocese went off to (public) school, so such schools mattered in our scheme of things. We seem to have lost the taste for principals of theological colleges, and I doubt if we would nowadays choose the full-time organizing secretary of an English Anglo-Catholic pressure group for a bishop. You might still sometimes see ex-'colonial' bishops on shortlists; two of our twentieth-century primuses had served as bishops overseas. I have seen the case made that the appointment of St Matthias was a mistake, and that we should have waited until St Paul came on the scene, but I would personally be happy with a system that allowed a diocesan electoral synod to approve a shortlist, and then prayed and drew lots on the shortlist.

Of course, now that we have pensions and a recommended retiring age, the church no longer has very frail and elderly bishops. Did you ever hear of the one Scottish bishop who refused to pray for King George when Prince Charles Edward died, and then went on, by himself, to consecrate a new nonjuring bishop? When he was questioned about this the poor old soul denied all knowledge, and he said, 'Ask my sister – she looks after everything'. We have made a serious change in not having very elderly bishops. There has been no real shift to having perceptibly younger ones. Bishop Forbes of Brechin and Bishop Ewing of Argyll (bishops at 30 and 32 and consecrated together in 1847) were chosen because they were gentlemen with private means. They became extremely interesting and worthwhile bishops, though their colleagues as bishops found them both a serious source of embarrassment as one was the most Anglo-Catholic and the other the most liberal bishop in Britain in their day. A young bishop has time to develop his own lines of thought. But on the other hand, Bishop Robberds of Brechin was Primus at 45 in 1908, which is young, and gave us what strikes me as a quarter of a century of caution and tradition in gaiters. Bishop Howe of St Andrews (bishop at 35) who I was told talked, even when young, just like the great Archbishop Michael Ramsey, so perhaps people thought him old for his years, went off to be an official of the Anglican Communion. There are not many clergy priested at 24 in the old style. High-flyers come in having done something interesting beforehand. The present Bishop of Brechin was only ordained priest ten years ago, not quite as swift

as his predecessor A. P. Forbes, but evidence that the church can make up its mind quickly.

Some Christian traditions have democracy in their lifeblood and praise God for it, but the Scottish Episcopal Church spent centuries fawning over a despicable dynasty and took to synods slowly. Nowadays I have been on our General Synod and have experienced the type of vote where a minority of the College of Bishops can thwart the will of the House of Clergy and of the House of Laity (and indeed of most of their episcopal colleagues). To be honest I found this intriguing rather than threatening. Two or three kind-faced middle-aged men holding up their hands in public, are nothing like the structural mechanisms of social control that we meet all the time. It may be that diocesan bishops, in a world where clergy are harder to find, have less power over against their individual clergy, and more against their individual congregations.

There might be a question whether anyone can rewrite doctrine. Though most Christian churches have produced some competent theologians, few of these are temperamentally creed-writers. The sort of bishop who fancies writing creeds for his flock should probably be steered into something less risky. We come from a church which quite innocently pitched on two well-known creeds from the early church, short enough to be memorized, and said these are enough. The intention is clear: we can individually develop our theology as we please, as long as we are careful not to betray the Apostles' and Nicene creeds. It gives quite wide scope. If you are temperamentally heterodox, then of course it is not wide enough, but you will probably discover that and go off and found your own church. We seem to have more trouble with those who want our bishops to hunt down heresy. A skilful inquisitor does not make a good bishop (there's a hint to a short-listing panel). Possibly even to have the talents to be a good external examiner for a PhD is not quite what is needed. Our church's doctrine, like our church's life, is a ragbag, because the coherence and structure we daydream about is often not apparent, and often attempts to capture it are deathly. We are not a church built round a confessional scheme. Praise God for the Westminster Confession, but it is not for us.

The name we have put on our package is 'episcopal', and that means that when the press wants to ask questions, they expect to meet a bishop. Quite right too, and bishops have a great advantage over any spokesperson of a presbytery. Bishops can speak for their diocese; they are our public face. There was a time when a Scottish newspaper could stir up popular sentiment because of folk-memories of 'proud prelates' of the past. (Another memo to a short-listing panel: do not choose men, or even women, who could easily be mistaken for proud prelates.) This is no longer a real problem.

I presume a large proportion of Scotland's population think a bishop is a chessman, if they have ever heard the word.

Here were my thoughts when Bishop Anne was appointed: I like having a bishop. Local congregations, especially in a time when numbers are not growing, tend to spend time worrying about keeping the show on the road, and any neighbour is something of a threat because they might mean a take-over bid. But our bishop is our own father (or now mother) in God, whose visits are not threatening but encouraging. The wonderful one-thousand-year-old system whereby Scotland, like England and the rest of Europe, is divided into geographical parishes, so that everyone could walk to church, is creaking, because the established churches are short of ministers. And if your only unit is the parish, then whom do you turn to as still your father (or mother) in God in what might be a prolonged vacancy, or if, heaven forbid, you can't cope with your minister. A bishop is a friendly individual face, not a committee, and, heaven help us, not a court, and you are part of his or her flock. You have a right to talk to your bishop, and it is one of the blessings of being a minority church that Bishop Bruce and Bishop Bob knew lots of people in every congregation by name – and so will Bishop Anne. In the old language used when a bishop instituted a priest to a parish was the phrase "Receive the cure of souls, which is both mine and thine". 'Cure' is the old word for the task of looking after and the bishop retains the cure of souls of everyone in his or her diocese and shares it with his or her priests. I'm sure an interim moderator does a good job in a vacancy, but bishop (*episcopos)* is an older and more biblical role. As it says in the old Authorised Version: "For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls" (I Peter 2. 25). Christ is the role-model of a good bishop.

I am not a clergyman, but I think having a bishop to turn to is good for ministers too. When everything is going well, then to be pope of your own parish must be wonderful, but it is worthwhile to have a father or mother in God to turn to when things go wrong. Christianity is indeed about how we are all brothers and sisters, but it is as well to have fathers and mothers too. So welcome, Bishop Anne, younger than I but my new mother in God.

Where Does the Bishop Stand in the Church? Perspectives from that Other 'English Church'[1]

GREGORY K. CAMERON
Bishop of St Asaph[2]

The Church in Wales offers a grant of £4750 to a new bishop upon election in order to assist with the purchase of robes. This may seem to be a strange and frivolous place at which to begin reflections on the nature of episcopacy, but it is at this moment that a bishop-elect has to start making the sort of choices by which the reactions and responses that she will elicit will be determined, and which may even set the tone of her episcopal ministry.

To go purple, or to stay in black? This is not a sartorial choice, you understand, but to define an episcopal ministry: either as something which is set apart from what the Church quaintly used to call 'the inferior clergy', or which, as one of my former archdeacons used to say, becomes an exercise in 'ostentatious humility'. Does the bishop-elect go for smaller mitres that resemble nothing more fanciful than caterers' bonnets or for tall golden, bejewelled and crown-like structures? (There's a curious counterpoint in the logo adopted by one archbishop I know in the Anglican Communion: the motto around the edge proclaims him to be 'Unworthy Servant of the Most Worthy Lord' while 50% of the design as a whole is taken up with the most glorious and crown-like mitre imaginable.)

No doubt personal taste ends up accounting for a lot of the choices, but more than one bishop must have pondered the old French proverb: 'Golden crozier, wooden bishop; wooden crozier, golden bishop'. For crucially, how does a bishop present himself as one who carries the authority of apostolic ministry? More than one parishioner will tell you 'I like my bishops to look

---

[1] 'Historically, the description of the SEC as 'the English Church' in Scotland is incorrect but has enough of the truth in it to be an awkward presence.' David Jasper, *The Question of Episcopal Authority in the Scottish Episcopal Church (*above). In Wales, chapel goers liked to name the Anglican Church *Y hen estrones*, 'that old stranger'.

[2] I am conscious of the real link between this diocese of North Wales with Scotland. Not only was Asaph, in the inherited story, consecrated by St Mungo, or Kentigern, as we call him, but it was one of my predecessors, Samuel Horsley, who was one of the chief promoters, in the House of Lords, of the Scottish Episcopalians Relief Act of 1792. I am delighted therefore to celebrate these links by offering these poor reflections.

like bishops' and there's no doubt that congregations feel affirmed when the bishop comes and puts on a show. So: should a bishop play into expectations or subvert them?

When the (in)famous Harries Report was commissioned by the Church in Wales in 2010, the Bench of Bishops and provincial Standing Committee were bold enough to ask the reviewers to tackle three main issues. As the centenary of disestablishment approached, how fit for purpose were the structures, the resources and the leadership of the Church in Wales? The answer to the last part of the question, when the report was published in 2012, wasn't particularly congenial: 'The Church in Wales is still characterised by a culture of deference and dependence.[3]'

Here's the rub, since for centuries the predominant model of episcopacy has been monarchical. Our bishops, at least after the Tractarian Movement and the revival of Catholic ritual, are liturgically dressed like medieval monarchs, and are often tempted to behave like them. The glamour that attaches to the episcopal office, the robes, the deference, the insignia, and the background ambience, created by the suppressed longing of maybe a third of the clergy that one day they might be bishops as well, seduce. The diocesan system is predicated on all authority flowing from the bishop. It is he that enables and licenses all ministry: the bishop alone does not have to be licensed in order to conduct her ministry, as all ministry is technically hers. The diocesan bishop is often ex officio a member of every significant committee in the diocese, even if he chooses not to attend although there are manifold ways to ensure that a committee decision is influenced to go in the right direction.

The vast majority of the women and men I have known as bishops have been honourable people, and passionate to see the Church be successful in the proclamation of a Gospel that will liberate and transform lives. However, in their desire to reform the Church, it is often all too easy to live by the first half of that famous Chinese/South African/Amerindian proverb: 'If you want to travel quickly, travel alone', than by the more tedious, taxing and enervating balancing phrase: 'if you want to travel far, travel together'. In the desire to break through, it is often quite simply easier to dictate than to confer.

The flipside is that the Church at large colludes with this. 'We want our bishops to demonstrate leadership' is a common chant, by which, of course, people so often mean 'to lead us by disposing and deciding matters as we want them disposed and decided'. However, it is also so much easier when

---

[3] Paragraph 4, page 4 of 'The Church in Wales Review', https://cinw.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Church-in-Wales-review-English.pdf (accessed 26 November 2018).

someone else takes the responsibility. Anyone associated with an episcopally ordered church will have heard the way in which congregational members and clergy will talk alike about 'the diocese' as the agent of every bad initiative since Judas set out to betray Christ, and in all such talk, 'diocese' is often a euphemism for the bishop.

The truth is, at least in the West, that an anxious church is on the backfoot. Congregations are getting older (any work with under fifties qualifies as youth work) and numbers of Sunday attendances are falling fast (the Church in Wales has lost half its membership over the last forty years). Everyone wants to see something done, but no-one wants change to happen in their backyard. We have too many buildings (at least in Wales), but no-one wants to see their own church closed, even if we're down to half a dozen on a good Sunday. We want to see outreach to young people and to see them in church, but equally, we want them to sit quietly and appreciate the glories of the 1984 Prayer Book, and they're not to sit in Mrs Jones's pew, because Mrs. Jones has sat there since 1920, and has been churchwarden since 1932. As one cartoon that has done the rounds on social media says: 'We'd like a new pastor who will enliven the worship, bring in young people, offer a prophetic ministry and grow the Church … without changing anything.'

In a church like this – and while it is a caricature, it is still how much of the Church in Wales feels like – it is easy to look for a messiah, and many of the clergy often feel too tired juggling all the balls and overestimating the amount of paperwork to do more than maintain the status quo. Even such ministry as they assay, and it can be overwhelming, they often feel bad about, because the congregation isn't quite what they thought it could be last Sunday, and Mr Smith, the local malcontent, has just thrown a wobbly about the removal of two pews at the back of the church to create a space for young families, and squashed the Vicar with a few hand-chosen put downs.

In such a church, it is easier to accord those glorious purple shirted successors of the apostles with both the power and the glory – and the blame. Perhaps, just perhaps, there is the occasional omnicompetent, charismatic individual who can fulfil the job description, and singlehandedly renew the Church. However, in my experience, God very rarely puts all his gift eggs in one basket, and where great gifts are given, great flaws often lurk in the shadow side of things. Monarchical episcopacy is the great 'Get out of Gaol Free' card for the people of God.

There's a very good parish exercise known to many called 'Where do you stand in the Church?' The idea is that the facilitator produces a number of cards to bedeck the wall of the church meeting room at various points. Each of them bears a legend offering a particular aspect of the nature of the Church – Mother, Prophet, Temple, Peacemaker, Servant, Healer, Lawgiver, and, perhaps most tellingly, on the open church hall door 'Outside'. There

are any number of different possible combinations. The aim of the exercise is to ask participants to stand at one label or perhaps near or between the two or three descriptions with which they most identify. Not only is it illuminating for everyone to see where the congregation congregates, but it can often prove to be the prelude to an animated discussion starter on what the Church ought to be.

So what might a game of 'Where does the bishop stand in the Church' look like? There are a handful of old labels ready to hand: Prelate, Chief Pastor, Apostle, High Priest. Then there are the more modern epithets: Team Builder, Social Reformer, Publicist, Manager.

It is easy to see why the older terms are going out of fashion. The golden mitres and kissed rings have lost their lustre and old fashioned high-minded esoteric paternalism sits uncomfortably with the modern age, which views hierarchies with suspicion. In any case, any residual loyalty and blind obedience is assailed by the instant expertise and judgmentalism of social media.

It is also easy to see why some of the latter terms have gained traction in recent years. The Church has tended to be woefully inept when it comes to managing the resources, both capital and human, of the Church. A curiously amateur approach has characterized the deployment of our human resources. Simply using language of 'human resources' might be enough to rile some readers, which just goes to show how we like to eschew such worldly criteria, but the truth is that some bishops could be open to the accusation that they fail their clergy by instituting them to a parish, and then leaving them to sink or swim without any clear direction of travel, instruments of support, training, appraisal and job development.

A cynical friend of mine was once overheard to say, 'A cleric can take retirement at any age. There is just one rule. Don't inform anyone.' There is a curious situation where clergy can be left quietly to neglect their duties without anyone holding them to account. The former Bishop of London reflected with a journalist shortly after retirement on how church decline had dominated religious life in his former metropolis. He mused upon an incumbent with two assistants who allowed a thriving congregation to decline by a third in two years: 'It apparently occurred to no one that this was a scandalous situation'.[4]

However, it is equally true that clergy can burn themselves out as they give themselves unstintingly to ministry and where they are conscientious. There is always another parishioner that could be visited, another theological book to digest in order to inform the sermon, another repair to

---

[4] Interview with Madeleine Davies, 'Soup, but glorious soup', *Church Times*, 24 February 2017.

be assayed or commissioned in the church building. Most clergy, studies tell us, work fifty or more hours a week.[5] The days when a bishop might take a leisurely horse-ride to drop in for tea with the theology-writing parson, or regularly compose handwritten letters to ask after the health of the clergy spouse or children, are long gone.

So instead, the parochial clergy are often left in danger of little ongoing training, small opportunity to be coached in skills or receive support and are expected to intuit their way into professionalism. Career, personal and professional development can be vaguely promised or hinted at in a clergy review scheme – and most dioceses have got round to doing something on this front – but follow up may be haphazard. Mission initiatives have the danger of loading more and more expectations on the clergy, while their training still equips them for a one-church parish in which they can take the Parish Eucharist on a Sunday and invest in pastoral ministry for the rest of the week. The freehold cure of souls, once imparted for twenty years or more at a stretch, is largely a thing of the past, and modern ministry takes place at a more frenetic level, with the vast majority of the parish's population largely beyond the reach of the parson, and with daily professional demands which take many unexpected and even uncongenial forms.

Add to this the precipitous decline experienced by the Church as secularism has tightened its grip on Western society, and it is not hard to see that a more structured and earnest approach has a lot to commend it. As the resources of the Church dwindle, effectiveness is a thing to be prized. Time honoured principles of formation and prayer therefore give way to upskilling, ministerial evaluation and goal setting. Professional safeguarding procedures have replaced a ramshackle process which overlooked the occasional abuser who could slip away into the shadows. Training seminars and team meetings fill the diary. Strategic planning and growth initiatives remind clergy and laity alike that old models of maintenance merely shepherded decline, and that conscious and mindful strategies must be put in place to orient the Church towards evangelization.

A manager bishop can organize things so that the amateur curia of yesteryear becomes the shiny efficient diocesan office team ensuring that the diocese runs smoothly and expeditiously.

So, where does a bishop stand in the Church? First, the monarch has to give way to the **enabler**. The Church in Wales has taken seriously the recommendation of the Harries Report to institute a new mode of living in

---

[5] See, for example, the Ely Diocese Clergy Wellbeing Study, May 2017, http://www.elydiocese.org/application/files/9514/9613/4098/Clergy_Wellbeing_Survey_-_FULL_report_-_FINAL_12_May_2017.pdf, (accessed 24 November 2018).

its life. The report called for cultural change of a kind which would engender a release of new and creative energy.

What is needed is a new, more collaborative, style of leadership, modelled by the bishops and reflected at parish level. In the end this is about trust; letting people participate fully in decision making processes and then trusting them to own and implement those decisions.[6]

Changing characteristics have come to the fore in episcopal ministry. The divine right of bishops has to give way to a model which empowers collegiality. It is almost forty years since 'Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry', the seminal position paper of the World Council of Churches,[7] reminded us that episcopal ministry has to be recognized as collegial and communal as well as personal. The collegial element must increasingly refer not only to the Provincial Bench or College of Bishops, but the councils of the diocese which can no longer be treated as rubberstamping politburos. Such bodies need to reach maturity as instruments of participative collaboration in which the whole people of God are given ownership of the mission of the Church. (I still remember the first meeting of the Diocesan Standing Committee where three members dared, in the course of a discussion, to disagree with something that I had pontificated upon earlier in the meeting. I was quietly delighted that real debate was happening, only for all three to come up and make their humble apologies to me over lunch …)

If readers have noted any evidence of cynicism in this paper about the life of the Church, then let it be wholeheartedly extirpated by the fact that when laypeople are empowered, the quality and numbers of lay leaders and vocations go through the roof. I remember early grumbles about the 'Unlocking our Potential' initiative which is St Asaph's particular iteration of the Church in Wales' 2020 Vision: 'Where are all these lay leaders going to come from, Bishop?' It is certainly true in deep rurality that there remains a shortage of those with the energy and radicalism to assist the clergy in the renewal of the Church, but across the diocese lay people have stepped forward when they have believed that real permission and trust are being given for them to do so.

Such lay leaders do not just present themselves to the Church: they must be actively courted. Over the last ten years the diocese of St Asaph has sought to ensure that there are major initiatives, events and courses which have been aimed at mobilizing the laity. While the cynical might want to warn of the dangers of initiative fatigue, each initiative has produced a small but significant harvest of lay people becoming energized and desirous of

---

[6] Church in Wales Review, paragraph 4, page 4, see above.
[7] Accessed 24 November 2018 and available at https://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/102580/lima_document.pdf.

working with the diocese in the task of mission. The point is this: the days of passively waiting for leadership to present itself to us are over, the laity must be actively engaged, invited into participation and informed that they have permission to venture forth in mission.

Secondly, bishops need consciously to reclaim the **apostolic** office. I remember a powerful aphorism being offered at a clergy conference I attended some years ago when embarking on episcopal ministry.[8] 'We need our lay people to be more diaconal', said the speaker, our deacons, more priestly, our priests more episcopal ...' (Ah, I wondered, what will the next step be ...) 'and our bishops more apostolic'.

I find on average that two thirds of my ministry is taken up with administration. Simply entering the year's round of two meetings of the Governing Body, four meetings of the Bench of Bishops, four meetings of the Provincial and Diocesan Standing Committees each, the Board of Finance, monthly Bishop's Staff Meetings and diocesan team catch ups into the diary for the next year can fill acres of space. Add to that responsibilities where I am a trustee or ecumenical participant, liturgical commissions and the like, and there's barely a week which isn't heavily seasoned with meetings.

I don't resent nor am I complaining about any of this, nor are the facts rehearsed in the hope or expectation of sympathy. Not only am I the sort of sad individual who quite likes meetings, but seriously, most of the administration is either to do with strategic decisions about the direction of the Church, or actually about the care, well-being and deployment of those individuals called and authorized to serve the Church's mission. Such engagements impact on the functioning life and mission of the Church.

However, when there can be significantly more than 150 pastoral visits or interviews in the year in addition, together with the liturgical work, sermon preparation, ordinations and confirmations, the truth is that there is very little time or energy left to address the world outside the Church. In my ministry I was blessed with six years as a school chaplain, and six further years working in an educational charity. When I returned to ministry in the Church in Wales as Archbishop's Chaplain, I was literally astounded by just how churchy the Church was. The sharp impression has faded.

Yet, for all the long slow withdrawing of the tide which is the Church's influence in the twentieth century, bishops can still grab the headlines, and are still regarded as potentially newsworthy. To be apostolic surely requires us to marshal our capabilities and to seek to address the world outside of the

---

[8] Unfortunately, I remember the aphorism far better than I recall the name, date and location of the conference, or more particularly the speaker who commended it to us. If anyone out there can give me a citation, please let me know.

Church, to proclaim the good news of Jesus Christ in a way which is challenging, life-giving and attractive to society. I certainly haven't got much by way of a track record in this department to be able to blow my own trumpet, even if that were desirable. However, I do know, from personal experience, how a well-timed invitation to use cathedral space for an important public meeting, and a half-sensible intervention, can assist in the reversal of a major health board decision and bring hope to a large swathe of the general population. Likewise, a well-researched and well-timed public speech on homelessness can win a place at the top of the evening's broadcast national news.

The trick is to find a way to carry Christ with you into the public domain. The media love a bishop who is making waves – I'm sure they'd love the story even more if a bishop was caught in a compromising situation with his trousers down – but they're less interested when the message is overtly faith proclamation. Nevertheless, if Christ is to be preached in the marketplace, it is still probably the bishop who is among the best placed in today's Church to get the message to the 97% who don't form part of our flocks.

One vital element of an apostolic ministry to be weighed by the bishop is to decide how consciously prophetic her office allows her to be. I recall on one occasion trying to articulate what it was that distinguished the exercise of episcopal ministry in the Anglican and Roman Catholic traditions. The proposition that I put forward was this: For Roman Catholic bishops it appears that it is the height of arrogance to assume that they should promote personal convictions and proclaim anything other than the faith of the Church. For Anglicans, it is the height of arrogance to think that they can presume to speak on behalf of the whole Church rather than speak from their own personal integrity and convictions. It is certainly true that many Roman Catholic bishops will be far more open in private when discussing their exceptions to the magisterial teaching of the Church than they are prepared to publicize dissenting views in open fora, while there is scarcely an Anglican bishop who is slow to articulate their personal perspectives on the latest hot topic of debate, whether it be the issues of equal marriage or belief in the incarnation. Is it the role of a bishop to affirm expectations or subvert them?

Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, we can't avoid the matter of **faith**. For all that a bishop is called to liberate the people of God for mission and ministry in the world, and to articulate the application of God's good news to the world in Jesus Christ on behalf of God's people, it can't go anywhere unless it springs from a personal and lively encounter with the divine, and a waiting upon God's Word. It was the famous theologian Karl Barth who once said something like 'the best theology must be done on your knees', and it is, in the end, probably true that 'the best episcopacy is done

on your knees', not only bringing your people and your diocese before God, but investing in that communion with Christ which is the still centre from which all fruitful ministry can take place.

We know that the very title of bishop derives from the Greek *episkopos*, which means something like the 'overseer' or 'supervisor'. We can see this rather grandly as the oversight of God's people, of supervising the intersection between the universal and the local, or between the synchronic and the diachronic. Or it may simply be a case of spotting where God is at work, and joining in. Christ himself articulated his ministry in this way: '[…] the Son can do nothing of his own accord, but only what he sees the Father doing. For whatever the Father does, that the Son does likewise' (John 5.19).

The exercise of a ministry like this can only be predicated on a foundation of God watching, of investing in the time and space to become so acquainted with the paths of God that we know where to look in order to catch a glimpse of the flames of the burning bush out of the corner of our eyes so that we might help the Church– and the world – to turn aside and to approach the divine presence.

Bishops – Some Thoughts and Pathways

MICHAEL JACKSON
Archbishop of Dublin and Bishop of Glendalough

Bishops do not exist, nor do they function, in a vacuum in the Anglican tradition. Bishops live and work within a framework of Trinitarian communion that shapes life theologically as we know it. It also equips us all, through baptism, to express our faith and to interpret the world scripturally from Genesis through to Revelation in a relational way. Doctrine and relationship combine; doctrine and worship combine. As we discern signs of God's kingdom on earth, we disclose expressions of the *perichoresis* (literally: dancing with one another) that is the inner life of the Trinity. We are called to make an outward reflection and expression of this life in our daily discipleship. Bishops work within this framework like everyone else.

Anglicanism is an untidy ecclesiology. In many ways it is a theology in search of a church. Anglicanism is not confessional although many today seek to make it so. Provisionality around structures and systems is part of its lifeblood, its versatility of expression and its way of being ecumenical while having principles of interpretation and application of its own. Right from the days of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I, adaptation to ever-changing political events driving the public and private expression of religion has been the hallmark of what we now call Anglicanism. Anglicanism is an international communion. In every country and continent, except England, it is a numerical minority in the wider sociology. Its lifeblood is *ecumenical:* it constantly needs interaction with and learning from other traditions. Its lifeblood is also *interfaith*: it needs to understand the architecture of faith in world faiths to which it is a very small neighbour, if it is to participate in constructing and sustaining the partnerships essential to a cohesive civil society relevant to different parts of the world. Its lifeblood is also *secular* in that it is an everyday church, with enough ceremonial to be dignified, enough theology to be Godly and enough principled discipleship to be engaged in the life of the world. It has no magisterium in its teaching and legislation. The Thirty-nine Articles are a focus of willing assent. They are not a subject or object of belief. Through the choices made at the Reformation, what we now call Anglicanism overwhelmingly lost its monastic wing and self-understanding. Again, this is the context for lived episcopacy.

At the Reformation, the importance and indeed primacy of the bishop in Word and Sacrament was preserved as was ministry in all three Orders: deacon, priest, bishop. The Anglican tradition is clear that a bishop never

ceases to be both a deacon and a priest. In such an historic way, a bishop can rightly be described as a focus of unity and a leader in mission. This is not to deprive others of such initiative. This is because the bishop bears the apostolic responsibility of carrying forward, embodied in all three Orders of Ministry, in a personal episcopacy, the 'being sent by the Father of the Son' with all the baptized who likewise are baptized into the death of Christ in the power of the Trinity. The Reformation was not so much an instantaneous seismic theological event but akin to today's slow release pain-killer or antibiotic. Ordination was challenged as a mediatorial priesthood and as a providential hierarchy on the grounds that there was no basis for these as readings of the New Testament texts. The Reformers generally saw no distinction between bishops and presbyters and they saw election by the people as common in apostolic times. By 1662, in the Church of England in the Preface to the Ordinal, ordination by a bishop is explicitly made essential for ordination to ministry. The point is made clearly, however, that bishops and priests are separate orders of ministry and not different degrees within the same ministry. Catholic and reformed elements combine with synodical polity in today's episcopacy.

The context in which Anglican bishops do their work is the obvious one of enabling, with other ministers, the ever-growing number of lay people struggling with who they are in everyday life as Christians and often under pressure for not participating in the social and religious habits of their friends and relations. This is a thoroughly patristic context that has not changed, however modern or post-modern we think ourselves today. The life of lay Christians and bishops is lived in situations of tension, whether it be with the adverse force of secularism or of the militant expression of intra-Christian sectarianism, atheism or of another world faith acting in a particularly exclusivist way. Another patristic context that has not changed is that the local church expresses the entire ecclesial mystery. The eucharistic assembly is a sign of the church and brings the church into being in a visible way and enables the church to fulfil its mission. In this the bishop, while he or she may delegate and share such ministry with priests, is entirely Trinitarian in having a direct commission to mission from Christ through the church and furthermore the gift of the Spirit appropriate to his/her order and responsibility. While Anglicans can rightly be charged with secession from former ecclesial norms, there are principles on which the secession is based; there is the continuing quest for ecumenical repairing of our many broken relationships; there is the discernment of the old-and-new pathways in our ecclesiological experiment in eschatological life. All of these form our identity. Classical Anglicanism would furthermore adhere to the Canons of the African Church: 'In local matters the bishops in council made their own

decisions; where the faith of the universal church was concerned, there was always an appeal to what other churches believed.'

The most sustained recent exploration of episcopacy in the Anglican tradition is the *Virginia Report* in 1996.[1] While it predates the ordination of women to the episcopate, the continuing advantage of Virginia is that it argues and advances a biblical and theological rationale of episcopacy as being both Christological and Trinitarian. The theology of Anglicanism is simply set out (1. 10-12): 'the unity of the Anglican Communion derives from the unity given in the triune God, whose inner personal and relational nature is communion. This mystery of God's life calls us to communion in visible form, for the purpose of a mission of love and reconciliation in the world, more than strengthening the peace and unity of the Anglican Communion.' The value of this definition is that it locates the total context of togetherness and, by extension of episcopacy, as having a pivotal role in unity, in the Trinity and gives to words like communion and mission a theological reality prior to any functional role they have in the life of the earthly church. In Anglicanism, all ministry is a Spirit-led expression of the ministry of the scriptural story of salvation as in St Matthew 11. 27: 'No one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.' And it is the power of the Holy Spirit that draws us into a divine fellowship of love and unity – which, therefore, again is not solely an ecclesiastical function.

It is this Trinitarian, Christological, intellectual and liturgical framework that we locate the ministry of oversight/episcopacy that is personal, collegial and communitarian: a bishop is bishop of somewhere rather than of nowhere – somewhere that is a community. Episcopacy does not, nor has it ever, in the Anglican tradition, set out to offer structural and institutional uniformity. The focal point in Anglicanism is local and diocesan, not central or global; nor again is it parochial and congregational. This means that the members of the Anglican tradition need to work hard theologically, whether lay or ordained, to remain critical, eschatological Christians rather than comfortable institutionalized church members. Episcopacy in being personal is not self-referential but self-giving in the shared baptismal witness of God's people in the church and to the world.

In the modern world, contextual dialogue is vital in lived Anglicanism. The range of voices that constitute the local contexts that in turn contribute

---

[1] Being Anglican in the Third Millennium: The Official Report of the 10th Meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council: Panama, 1996, *includes The Virginia Report and The Dublin Liturgical Report, compiled by James M Rosenthal and Nicola Currie (Anglican Communion, 1997).*

to the global context, is something everyone is seeking to address through a creative use of the instruments of communion: the Anglican Consultative Council, the Lambeth Conference, the Primates' Meetings and the respect for the Archbishop of Canterbury in his office. The challenge is to recognize the priority of the local through the doctrine of subsidiarity; for the local to recognize the contextual dilemma and difficulty of the 'Other' in such a way as not to endanger, by the exercising of selfish local and individual choice, the responsibilities local to other provinces. This requires a radical conservatism on the part of the bishops, a rootedness in scriptural tradition which in and of itself does not contain a ready answer to every contemporary question. The bishop, as a radical conservative, straddles the divide in a particular way between scriptural principle and sociological practice. Our decision-making structures are morally authoritative and not juridically binding across provinces. In large parts of the world, churches have to work with two potentially competing expressions of human rights entitlements: one is the freedom of the individual to live in line with the laws of the land and the other is the freedom of a church or other faith community to order its life internally according to its own regulations; the problem comes when the two collide.

The primacy of diocese and province has to do with the reality of subsidiarity by which the global is in effect built out of the series of local expressions of lived method. This is the antithesis of the corporatized business world in which we live and by which we are conditioned. Subsidiarity leaves us to grapple with the local working out, inside our own churches and ecumenically in our vicinity, of the words: one, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. We are part of God's reconciling work – always with others. The church is commissioned to mission, reconciliation is its role and the bishop must teach and learn the faith at the same time. This is because the faith is not distinct from everyday life. The engaged nature of the Anglican episcopacy by which bishops are not bishops-at-large but bishops-in-see means that bishops are very much part of subsidiarity, the paramountcy of the local. There is a diversity of levels on which the God-given mission of the church is worked out. This means that Anglican bishops by their involvement in this mission are servants in leadership as well as leaders in service. The Minutes of the 1979 Primates' Meeting, quoted in Virginia (3. 47) make important reading: 'The role of the Primates' Meeting could not be, and was not desired, as a higher synod … The Primates also expressed the opinion that there appears to be no issue that is the exclusive preserve of the Primates alone; all issues, doctrinal, ecclesiastical and moral, are the concern of the whole baptized community.'

Virginia argues (3. 51) that the irresolvable tension is between the autonomy of the diocese and the inevitable requests for the development of

primatial instruments sitting under Canterbury. The world in which we live demands independence but craves oversight – even if it continually challenges such oversight because it needs to assert afresh and in different ways its independence. The complex network of non-conciliar structures is designed to guard against isolation (and I myself suggest also against exploitation by self-interested third parties) and to keep Anglicans in a life of belonging together to one another, giving an expression to unity such as is given in the life of the divine Trinity. While fulfilling a function, its unity is theological. This is why the Virginia Report continues to do us service today.

In 2017, ARCIC III published its work in a volume entitled *Walking Together on the Way*.[2] It is very much about episcopacy and synodality. One of the findings of ARCIC III is the recommendation of a synodical system in the Roman Catholic Church along Anglican lines. But as we have discovered above, Anglican synodality and episcopacy with the definition of the bishop-in-synod requires a radical subsidiarity and a primary honouring of the local, however defined, over the central. Roman Catholic bishops would find themselves meeting in the midst of the rough and tumble of priests and people locally and on a much more regular basis under the Holy Spirit.

The shared deficit identified in both traditions concerns a balance in ecclesiology – conciliar with universal primacy and collegiality with primacy of equals. For the Anglican side, the suggestion is to strengthen commitments to communion across Anglican provinces and the making of the office of the Archbishop of Canterbury a type of superior primacy while avoiding the subversion of subsidiarity. Both sides would need to jump at the same time. The hard truth for the Roman Catholic partners is that the Holy Spirit is not all about bishops and the Pope but about people and priests also; the language and the patterns of church of Vatican II and the more radical voice of Francis seem not to have been sufficiently mainstreamed in a highly centralized church which is also a nation diplomatically and politically among nations. The hard truth for the Anglican partners is that we all rather enjoy our jurisdictional independence.

The problem, as pointed out by John Halliburton over twenty years ago regarding the Church of England is that the Synod, as we have it, is too dominated by the parliamentary model and style[3] – and the same goes for my own Church of Ireland. Parliament is not a good model for church life.

---

[2] Walking Together on the Way: Learning to be the Church – Local, Regional, Universal, *an agreed statement of the Third Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC III) Erfurt, (2017).*

[3] *John Halliburton, 'Order and the Episcopate' in* The Future of Anglicanism: Essays on Faith and Order, *ed. by Robert Hannaford (Gracewing, 1996)*

Parliament creates and sustains the government and the opposition as adversaries. Over the years our church culture has become more rather than less binary. The parliamentary model and its quest for rhetorical victory do not build shared community let alone a communion ethic.

All of this affects instruments of communion and directly affects bishops who will be their implementors, advocates or detractors. All power and authority are open to abuse and laxity. Anglicanism, however, ought not to be pilloried simply because it allows and encourages honest questioning and effectively despises hypocrisy; the problem in a sophisticated world is that one person's principle is another person's prejudice and vice versa. The 'receptive ecumenism' approach of ARCIC III offers to the Anglicans and the Roman Catholics the opportunity not to be ashamed of but to share deficiencies and needs as well as gifts and insights. The real question is: will both institutions make room for the inbreaking of a shared kingdom of God or will they continue to luxuriate in their mutual limitations and superiorities?

Is autonomy more attractive than universality? Is global uniformity more attractive than workaday subsidiarity? Receptive ecumenism invites us to attentive dialogue rather than megaphone ideology. But our concern is not the internal wranglings of Western Christianity. Rather it is to mark and celebrate the shared Trinitarian understanding of life and work, ministry and sacrament of baptized and bishop. A bishop never ceases to be a disciple and a child of God.

Episcopacy: An American Perspective

JAMES F. TURRELL
Norma & Olan Mills Professor of Divinity (University of the South)

The American Episcopal Church received two gifts from the Scottish Episcopal Church in 1784: the eucharistic liturgy and the historic episcopate. Incorporated into the first American prayer book in 1789, the Scottish communion office's eucharistic prayer, with its West Syrian structure, oblation, and epiclesis, survived in each revision of the American prayer book, and it continues to shape all but one of the eucharistic prayers in American Prayer Book of 1979 and its authorized supplements. It would be recognizable, in its current form, to the original donors. By contrast, the version of episcopacy that Seabury received when he was consecrated by the bishop of Aberdeen, his coadjutor, and the bishop of Moray and Ross was compromised early in the church's history, as the model combined with the democratic culture of a new nation to produce a hybrid polity that constrained the bishops. Nevertheless, the model remains discernible in the church's formularies and the bishops' ministry.[1]

Competing visions in infancy
The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America[2] nearly lost its episcopal character at the American Revolution, as serious consideration was given to restructuring without the historic succession or bishops in any meaningful sense. As the Revolution came to an end, the Rev. William White, rector of Christ Church, Philadelphia, published *The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered*, in which he argued that the

---

[1] Not being a bishop, I am grateful to the Rt Revd J. Neil Alexander and the Revd Dr Benjamin J. King for their comments on a draft; remaining errors are my own.

[2] The alternative form, 'The Episcopal Church', has been recognized by the church's constitution since 1967 (*Annotated Constitution and Canons for the Government of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America…*, ed. by Edwin Augustine White and Jackson A. Dykman [New York: Church Publishing Incorporated, 1985, 1997], pp. 4-6.) The title and its acronyms are problematic: 'ECUSA' (Episcopal Church in the United States) omits the non-domestic dioceses and has been discouraged since the 2009 General Convention. 'TEC' ('The Episcopal Church') gives inevitable offence to other episcopal churches, especially the more venerable Scottish Episcopal Church.

episcopate emerged as a separate entity from the presbyterate, and that its only foundation was apostolic practice, not a command. Citing Cranmer and Hooker, White argued that in exigent circumstances, ordination by bishops might be omitted.[3] White framed the episcopate as, at most, part of the *bene esse*, or well-being of the church, rather than its *esse* (being) or *plene esse* (fullness) – bishops were unnecessary.

White asserted that there was no means by which the ordination of a bishop for America might be procured. The state of war made ordination by English bishops unlikely, but White also ruled out peremptorily the prospect of procuring a bishop in the historic succession from any other source: 'the proposal to constitute a frame of government, the execution of which shall depend on the pleasure of persons unknown, differing from us in language, habits, and perhaps in religious principles, has too ludicrous an appearance to deserve consideration....'[4] At roughly the same time in 1782 that White wrote, George Berkeley encouraged the Scots to ordain a bishop for the Americans, noting that the episcopate was a 'necessity' – part of the church's *esse*.[5] Multiple options existed: the Scots, the Swedes, and the Moravians preserved the historic episcopate, and an approach was made to the Danes.[6] Because White did not view bishops as part of the *esse* of the church, he was not forced to overcome his xenophobia.

If instead one saw bishops as part of the *esse* of the church, one would go to lengths to procure them. Such a view dates to the reign of Elizabeth I, and it was further developed under James I.[7] New England clergy had sought a bishop in colonial days.[8] But the *Case* forced the issue, and they sent Seabury to Scotland.

Charles Wesley, angered by his brother's appointment of 'superintendents', noted that the Scottish bishops had sent back to America

---

[3] William White, *The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered* (Philadelphia: David C. Claypoole, 1782), pp. 23-25, 28-34.

[4] White, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

[5] Samuel Wilberforce, *A History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America*, 3rd edn (London: Rivingtons, 1856), p. 199-202.

[6] On Denmark, see William White, *Memoirs of The Protestant Episcopal Church in The United States of America* ed. by B. F. DeCosta (New York: E.P. Dutton & Company, 1880), pp. 327-29.

[7] Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society 1559-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), pp. 16-21.

[8] For example, Lambeth Palace Library, Fulham Papers, vol. 1, pp. 245-46, 292-93, 296.

a 'real primitive Bishop.'[9] Seabury embodied what had been difficult for many to imagine: a bishop with spiritual authority but no temporal power, free of all encumbrances of the state. Alone in the early days of TEC, he was active in visiting his diocese and confirming with regularity, covering about nine thousand miles while also serving as incumbent in a parish.[10] By contrast, White (who changed his mind about the episcopate once he manoeuvred his election[11]) only visited the western part of his diocese twice, concerning himself with Philadelphia, where he continued as rector.[12] If bishops were not essential, White's approach was reasonable, but if they were part of the *esse*, one needed an active, 'primitive Bishop'.

Seabury's ecclesiology placed the bishop at the center of the church. In 1785, he argued:

> Government as essentially pertains to Bishops as ordination; nay, ordination is but the particular exercise of government. Whatever share of government Presbyters have in the Church, they have from the Bishop, and must exercise it in conjunction with, or in subordination to him...[13]

Seabury was clear that bishops were not to be judged by laypersons, but his regular consultation with his presbyters reflected the 'reduced episcopacy' proposed by Archbishop James Ussher of Armagh in 1641 (and echoed in the 1660 Worcester House Declaration), in which bishops were to govern with the advice of the presbyters.[14]

Thus, the model inherited from Seabury is of a 'primitive', pastoral bishop in collegial relationship with his presbyters, independent of the laity. From the earliest days in TEC, this existed alongside the model inherited

---

[9] Paul Victor Marshall, *One Catholic, and Apostolic: Samuel Seabury and the Early Episcopal Church* (New York: Church Publishing, 2004), p. 68.

[10] Ibid., pp. 2, 104; Bruce E. Steiner, *Samuel Seabury, 1729-1796: A Study in the High Church Tradition* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1971), pp. 314-38.

[11] Marshall, op. cit., p. 248.

[12] Walter H. Stowe, 'William White, Ecclesiastical Statesman', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 22 (1953), (p. 377); Bird Wilson, *Memoir of the Life of the Right Reverend William White, D.D.* (Philadelphia: James Kay, Jr., 1839) p. 215.

[13] Reprinted in Marshall, op. cit., p. 368.

[14] Steiner, op. cit., pp. 234-37, 258; Marshall, op. cit., pp. 67-76, 240-43; Jonathan Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1991), pp. 26, 34-35.

from White, of lay assemblies with extensive powers and bishops with modest authority. Seabury's example fits the view of bishops as part of the *esse* of the church; White's example fits the view of bishops as a lovely but superfluous addition, part of its *bene esse*. These two models interacted to shape TEC's polity.

The Prayer Book vision

The American 1979 Book of Common Prayer offers its own vision of a bishop's ministry, which emerges most clearly at two points in the ordination rite: the examination of the candidate and the ordination prayer itself. The examination begins with a description of the bishop's responsibilities. First, a bishop is 'called to be one with the apostles in proclaiming Christ's resurrection and interpreting the Gospel and to testify to Christ's sovereignty'.[15] This underscores the bishop's primary vocation as preacher and teacher of the essential *kerygma* of Christ crucified and risen. Deriving from this, several other aspects of the vocation are named. The bishop is 'called to guard the faith, unity, and discipline of the Church,' in other words, safeguarding that good news; called to celebrate the sacraments; called to ordain priests and deacons (and join in ordaining bishops); and 'to be in all things a faithful pastor and wholesome example'.[16] In short, the bishop is to be preacher, teacher, pastor, chief priest, and disciplinarian.

A series of interrogatories delve into the implications. Bishops promise to be 'faithful in prayer, and in the study of Holy Scripture', to 'boldly proclaim and interpret' the Gospel, to 'encourage and support all baptized people in their gifts and ministries' and celebrate the sacraments with them, to 'guard the faith, unity, and discipline of the Church', and to 'share with your fellow bishops in the government of the whole Church… sustain your fellow presbyters and take counsel with them… [and] guide and strengthen the deacons and all others who minister in the Church'. Finally, the bishop promises to 'be merciful to all, show compassion to the poor and strangers, and defend those who have no helper'.[17] While the list of promises is fairly lengthy, it can be summarized as requiring the bishop to proclaim the Gospel, govern and discipline the church in a collegial relationship with other bishops and with the presbyters of the diocese, and to celebrate (and provide for the celebration of) the sacraments. The ordination prayer itself situates the new bishop in the succession of 'prophets, priests, and kings,'

---

[15] *The Book of Common Prayer* (New York: Church Hymnal Corp., 1979) [henceforth, *BCP*], p. 517.

[16] *BCP*, p. 517.

[17] *BCP*, p. 518.

and it asks that God 'pour out upon *him* the power of your princely Spirit', to enable the new bishop to oversee the life of the church and to 'tend the flock of Christ'.[18] This reflects the influence of the Seabury model: the bishop works collegially with her presbyters but is ultimately responsible for governance and discipline.

Elsewhere in the prayer book, it is made clear that the bishop is the normative presider at the sacraments. The rubrics insist that the bishop, when present, is the celebrant at baptism and eucharist, and the ordinal makes clear that a presbyter's authority and liturgical presidency comes only by delegation from the bishop.[19] The bishop is also the normative preacher. Drawing on the imagery of the early church, the prayer book imagines that the fullest expression of the church is the eucharistic assembly, with the bishop presiding, the presbyters and deacons assisting, and the whole people of God participating. It is an image that one can find in Seabury's own thought.[20]

The 1979 Prayer Book presents the episcopate as a distinct order, drawing a contrast to the earliest days of Anglicanism. Cranmer's 1550 Ordinal and subsequent versions until the 1662 prayer book in England used the verb 'order' to title only the ordination of priests, referring instead to the 'making' of deacons and the 'consecrating' of bishops, reflecting the common thinking that bishops were simply presbyters with additional authority.[21] The 1662 BCP paired the title: 'The Forme of Ordeining or Conscrating of an Archbishop or Bishop,' a title that survived in the American prayer books through 1928. The current book instead uses the title 'The Ordination of Bishops.'[22] Small things, such as the required vesture of the bishop-elect, reinforce this. While the 1662 BCP added a rubric stipulating that the ordinand should be vested in a rochet, one sees images of English bishops appearing fully vested with the chimere as well, before the ordination

---

[18] *BCP*, p. 520-21.

[19] *BCP*, pp. 298, 354, 531, 561.

[20] Dan Handschy, 'Samuel Seabury's Eucharistic Ecclesiology: Ecclesial Implications of a Sacrificial Eucharist', *Anglican and Episcopal History,* 85 (2016), (pp. 7, 17-19).

[21] Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Anglican Ordinal: Its History and Development from the Reformation to the Present Day* (London: SPCK, 1971), pp. 6, 16, 31-33, 87-91.

[22] F. E. Brightman, *The English Rite* (London: Rivingtons, 1915), pp. 998-99; Paul V. Marshall, *Prayer Book Parallels* (New York: Church Hymnal Corp., 1989), pp. 620-21.

prayer.[23] The 1979 revision stipulated that the ordinand enters the church vested solely in an alb or rochet as the baptismal garment (the vesture of a bishop is added after the ordination prayer). This is not just costuming: it symbolically conveys that ordination to the episcopate is not another layer added atop priest's orders; the ordinand comes to the rite as a baptized person.[24] This contrasts with some authors' claims that a bishop is both deacon and priest as well.[25] In the Holy Eucharist, the rejection of 'layered ordination' is clear, in the stipulation that in the absence of a deacon, an assisting priest is to perform certain duties, lay persons others, and the celebrant still others – a direction that would be nonsensical if an assisting priest were 'still a deacon'.[26] The canons do not allow a layperson to be ordained bishop, and canonical changes to permit direct ordination to the presbyterate were voted down in 2003.[27] Nevertheless, the prayer book, at least, does not envision the bishop as a sort of Russian doll, containing within her a priest and a deacon.

The Catechism adds only a bit more. It describes the ministry of a bishop as:

> To represent Christ and his Church, particularly as apostle, chief priest, and pastor of a diocese; to guard the faith, unity, and discipline of the whole Church; to proclaim the Word of God; to act in Christ's name for the reconciliation of the world and the building up of the Church; and to ordain others to continue Christ's ministry.[28]

Apostle, teacher, pastor, priest, and guardian: the prayer book reflects that 'real, primitive bishop' that Charles Wesley hoped for the church in North America.

---

[23] Brightman, op. cit., p. 1005; https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-30974547 [accessed 30 November 2018].

[24] *BCP*, p. 511.

[25] Paul Avis asserts, 'The bishop is a deacon… According to the doctrine of sequential ordination that is inscribed in Anglican formularies, a bishop remains a priest.' Paul Avis, *Becoming a Bishop: A Theological Handbook of Episcopal Ministry* (London: T&T Clark, 2015), pp. 18-19.

[26] *BCP*, p. 354.

[27] Resolution 2003-C019, *Acts of Convention* (https://www.episcopalarchives.org/cgi-bin/acts/acts_resolution-complete.pl?resolution=2003-C019 [accessed 23 November 2018]).

[28] *BCP*, p. 855.

Checks and balances
This model is moderated by other church structures. Each bishop exists within the diocese in relation to a standing committee and a convention, which share in the governance of the church. The standing committee functions as a council of advice to the bishop and assumes governance of the diocese when the see is vacant.[29] Diocesan canons delineate the role of diocesan conventions, but these generally pass resolutions, approve budgets, and function as the legislature of a diocese.[30] The more obvious check on the authority of bishops lies in the churchwide General Convention. Beyond General Convention, there is no appeal, because the ultimate, earthly authority in Anglican ecclesiology rests with the national church, despite occasional attempts to invest the 'instruments of unity' with authority or to reinterpret the diocese as autonomous.[31] Metropolitical power is not vested in an archbishop, as in the Church of England, or in a college of bishops, as in the Scottish Episcopal Church, but in the General Convention.[32] Meeting every three years, it is comprised of a House of Bishops and a House of Deputies (of elected clergy and laity). This polity reflects the White model: the authority of bishops is subordinated to a mixed body of bishops, presbyters, deacons, and laity. The presiding bishop of TEC has no metropolitical power, and the House of Bishops cannot take legislative action without the consent of the lay and clergy Deputies. While the Presiding Bishop has been styled 'Primate' since 1982, this is only a recognition of his or her representative function in the Anglican

---

[29] *Constitution and Canons Together with the Rules of Order for the Government of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America…* (New York: General Convention Office, 2015), pp. 4-5.

[30] David B. Joslin, *Apostle in our Midst: The Office of Bishop* (Cincinnati: Forward Movement Publications, 1980), p. 13.

[31] James F. Turrell, 'A Dim Mirror: Archbishop Rowan Williams's Reflections on the 2009 General Convention', *Anglican Theological Review* 92 (2010), 492-96.

[32] Jim Simons, 'The Presiding Officers', in House of Deputies Special Study Committee on Church Governance and Polity, *Shared Governance: The Polity of the Episcopal Church* (New York: Church Publishing, 2012), p. 78; James A. Dator with Jan Nunley, *Many Parts, One Body: How the Episcopal Church Works* (New York: Church Publishing, 2010), p. 80; Richard F. Grein, 'Introducing "The Ministry of Bishops: A Study Document Authorized by the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church"', in *On Being a Bishop: Papers on Episcopacy from the Moscow Consultation 1992*, ed. by J. Robert Wright (New York: Church Hymnal Corporation, 1993), p. 65.

Communion; real 'primacy' is held by the General Convention as a whole.[33] In practice, the House of Bishops is often the more deliberative chamber, being smaller in size, with fewer membership changes from Convention to Convention. Diocesan bishops must also cope with the effects of General Convention's decisions on disparate congregations under their oversight, which may make them more cautious. As a result, deputies sometimes complain of the bishops serving as a check. (Originally, the House of Deputies could override the House of Bishops' veto, and the Bishops could not originate legislation, but the houses were given parity in 1808.[34]) Finally, the General Convention has essentially unlimited power over diocesan structures, including bishops.[35] No bishop has free rein in her diocese.

Lived Patterns
The quotidian work of a bishop varies according to the size, composition, and culture of the diocese, the needs of its people, and the gifts of the bishop. The church's constitution and canons set a floor: Canon III.12 'Of the Life and Work of a Bishop' stipulates that the bishop is to undertake a three-year formation process when first elected; to visit each congregation once every three years, and when visiting to preside at the Eucharist and initiatory rites, to preach, and to examine the parish records; to deliver pastoral letters on matters of doctrine, discipline, and worship; to record their official acts; to report to the diocesan convention each year on the state of the diocese; to live in their diocese; and to retire at age 72.[36] Alongside the spiritual role as 'chief priest and pastor', the bishop functions much like the chief executive of a non-profit corporation, with attending administrative responsibilities.[37] Bishops also serve a dual function as pastor to the clergy and as their disciplinarian, which can become a complicated relationship when allegations of presbyteral misbehavior arise. Many clergy long for more of a pastoral connection with their bishop. Many bishops try to offer that, though

---

[33] General Convention, *Journal of the General Convention of...The Episcopal Church, New Orleans, 1982* (New York: Office of the General Convention, 1983), p. C-37. This followed a failed attempt to retitle the presiding bishop as 'archbishop', though without metropolitical authority ('The Standing Commission on The Structure of the Church', in Episcopal Church, *The Blue Book: Reports of the Committees, Commissions, Boards and Agencies of the General Convention of the Episcopal Church* [New York: Office of the General Convention, 1982], pp. 340-41).
[34] Sally Johnson, 'The Work of the House of Bishops', in *Shared Governance* (see note 32), p. 30; Dator, pp. 55-56.
[35] Dator, op. cit., pp. 136, 143.
[36] *Constitution and Canons* (see note 29), pp. 112-25.
[37] Grein, op. cit., p. 67.

there are stories of bishops resorting to pastoral care by text-message, which seems to fall short of the apostolic ideal. Clergy and laity in some places express a desire for the bishop to set a vision for the diocese; this is counterbalanced by stories of conflicts between diocesan bishops and standing committees when the former attempted to impose a vision on an unwilling diocese. Some dioceses are heavily dependent on a few major parishes for most of their funding; in these places, it is the 'cardinal' rectors and not the bishop who wield greater actual power. Wise bishops select diocesan staff to complement their strengths and weaknesses, whether by hiring a competent administrator as canon to the ordinary to free the bishop for a more visionary or pastoral role or by hiring a canon pastor to attend to the needs of the clergy for support, but some are not as deliberate in this.

The formation of bishops has been problematic, in part because of the means of their selection. Bishops are elected from a slate developed by a search committee and approved by the standing committee of the diocese. After a background check, some sort of 'discernment retreat' that resembles the 'airport interview' of a secular job-hunt, and the genteel electoral manoeuvrings of on-site appearances, TEC trusts that the Holy Spirit will make herself known through the ballot. In defence of this arrangement, one is reminded of Ralph Waldo Emerson's remark that in the Church of England, the dean and canons 'invariably find that the dictates of the Holy Ghost agree with the recommendation of the Queen'[38] – TEC's method of discerning the will of the Holy Spirit is not entirely bizarre.

The vast majority of bishops were parish rectors at the time of their election; infrequently, a diocesan administrator such as a canon to the ordinary might be elected, and academics are rare indeed in the House of Bishops. The attributes that make one successful in parish ministry do not always spell success in the more-or-less itinerant ministry of an Episcopal bishop, and the intangible rewards articulated by parish clergy, of long-term connection with parishioners on their journey of faith, are largely absent from the work of a bishop. Leadership often means, in Friedman's words, serving as a well differentiated, 'non-anxious presence,'[39] and bishops are frequently called upon to say 'no' and to take the blame for things that were not their doing. Those who seek popularity or gratitude are likely to find the vocation challenging. On occasion, one finds bishops who grasped the brass ring of election only to find themselves temperamentally unsuited to the vocation.

---

[38] R. W. Emerson, *English Traits* (Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1866), p. 228.
[39] Edwin H. Friedman, *Generation to Generation: Family Process in Church and Synagogue* (New York: Guilford Press, 1985), pp. 3, 308-10.

Formation of bishops is undertaken *after* their election and ordination, in a three-year course of study, in contrast to the way that deacons and presbyters are formed educationally and spiritually before ordination. Further, it is only in the selection of bishops that the Episcopal Church combines discernment about vocation to an *order* of ministry with a job hunt for a particular *position*. The Task Force on Episcopacy created by the 2015 General Convention called for a method of quiet and candid discernment for potential candidates for bishop, together with formation well in advance of election to a particular diocese. General Convention in 2018 created a 'Pilot Board for Episcopal Transitions' charged with creating such a process.[40] It is rare for bishops to be translated to jurisdiction in a new, more attractive diocese ('from see to shining see'). Increasingly, bishops resign from diocesan jurisdiction to take some other job, often as assisting bishops (with delegated responsibilities but no jurisdiction) in larger dioceses or as rectors of prosperous parishes.

There are few suffragan bishops in the American church. These are only in the more populous and prosperous dioceses and are elected by the diocesan convention. Assisting bishops, elected in another diocese and resigned after serving for a period, provide a way for diocesan bishops to choose their assistants, rather than trusting the ballot. Both are anomalous: if not for the episcopal monopoly on confirmation in Anglicanism (in contrast to the rest of the Western Church), it is unclear such bishops would be necessary; a presbyter on the diocesan staff might exercise delegated oversight.

The Episcopal Church is confronting the aftermath of growth in the postwar baby boom. In the 1950s and 60s, parishes grew and prospered, and the church built its capacity (in buildings and organizational structures) to match. The end of the twentieth century saw a reversal. The reasons for decline are debated, and in part are related to a declining birthrate.[41] TEC now finds itself with more dioceses, and bishops, than it appears able to support. There have been a few attempts to merge dioceses that once had divided: the attempted merger of Eau Claire and Fond du Lac failed, while the merger of Chicago and Quincy succeeded. In other cases, a bishop of one diocese served as 'provisional bishop' of another. In some less-prosperous dioceses, the bishop serves simultaneously as parish rector, reminiscent of

---

[40] 'Task Force on the Episcopacy', in Episcopal Church, *Reports to the 79th General Convention Otherwise known as the Blue Book* Volume II (New York: Office of the General Convention, 2015), pp. 701-02, 711-13, 729-32.

[41] C. Kirk Hadaway, 'Is the Episcopal Church Growing (or Declining)?', pp. 13-17.   https://www.episcopalchurch.org/files/2004GrowthReport(1).pdf [accessed 23 November 2018].

the careers of White and Seabury. But the expectation that bishops should visit their parishes frequently and the duties to the national church that can put a bishop on the road as much as twenty percent of their time suggest that this may not be a sustainable model. The number of dioceses and of bishops may need to be 'right-sized', but the church has been slow. Nevertheless, the economic challenges confronting bishops, most of whose funding comes from parish contributions, are likely to increase.[42] Bishops will be called upon to do more with less.

The formularies of the church do not give much space to the role of bishop as leader of the 'missional church', a trendy phrase describing an outward-focused body rather than a self-preserving institution. But the calling of a bishop to be an apostle conveys this in a biblical image, and the tendency of some to bash institutions overlooks the reality that institutions are how humans organize themselves to accomplish long-term tasks. The popular desire in the American church today to cultivate its leaders' skills in 'community organizing' is simply a new twist on a two millennia-old challenge: how to draw disciples together to do the work of being the Body of Christ in the world. The 'real primitive bishop' represented by Seabury is the 'missional leader' of today. A bishop who follows the apostolic model will see her task as directing the energies of the Body of Christ towards its proper work in the world.

A series of essays in the 1990s tried to define the vocation of the bishop with greater clarity, focusing on three roles of the bishop: preacher/teacher, celebrant of sacraments, and conciliar leader. It described the bishop's role presiding in the Eucharist as an icon of episcopal leadership: collegial, within and for the community.[43] But Kortright Davis argued:

> The practice of episcopal ministry in the Episcopal Church is basically dependent less on the principles of the Ordinal and more on the predilections of the diocesan conventions, the aspirations of crypto-applicants, nominees, and candidates... The emergence of bishops in the Episcopal process is generally

---

[42] Peter Eaton, 'Opening Our Lives on Both Sides…: Reflections on Priesthood and Episcopacy in the Episcopal Church', *Sewanee Theological Review*, 57 (2013), pp. 27-8.

[43] Grein, op. cit., pp. 74-75; 'The Ministry of Bishops: A Study Document Authorized by the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church', in *On Being a Bishop* (see note 32), pp. 80-104; Roger J. White, 'The Practice of Episcopal Ministry in the Episcopal Church from a Bishop's Point of View', in *On Being a Bishop* (see note 32), p. 176.

> the result of getting the bishop you negotiate and not necessarily
> the bishop you need.[44]

Even if one were to elect the perfect bishop, her ministry would be hampered by the sociological landscape. In practice 'the harsh reality is that the Episcopal Church is far more congregationalist in behavior and impulsion than we are often prepared to admit. Episcopal bishops know this only too well.'[45] One is reminded of William White's indifference to the church beyond Philadelphia.

What, then, of the three roles: teacher, celebrant of sacraments, conciliar leader? Although there are few academics in the House of Bishops, many bishops see their teaching role as important. The Theology Committee of the House of Bishops helps the entire bench by providing a means by which bishops, in consultation with professional theologians, develop teaching documents for the church. Not every bishop is an Augustine of Hippo, but not everyone needs to be – and in truth not every theologian is, either. The bishop's role as presider at the Eucharist is properly at the center of her ministry,[46] and perhaps the itinerant ministry of episcopal visitations places that vision before the laity, particularly in those dioceses that have opted for regional confirmations, so that the bishop is not imagined primarily as a pair of magic hands imposed on the foreheads of adolescents. When the bishop works to help a diocesan community discern God's vision for itself (Kortright Davis wisely noted that the vision properly belongs to God, not humans), and then sees her task as enabling the ministry of others, this may best reflect the image of a 'conciliar leader', as well as the baptismal ecclesiology of the church. But Davis summed up the role of the bishop as 'father/mother in God', a pastor of pastors who is one with the people she serves – not a task-based role, but one defined by relationship.[47] Such relational ministry, in twenty-first century America, runs counter to the prevailing culture's transactional focus, stands as a corrective to the managerial impulse that sometimes dominates the church, and may be just

---

[44] Kortright Davis, '"And Who Is My Bishop?" A Priest's Response to Bishop White,' in *On Being a Bishop* (see note 32), p. 181.

[45] Ibid., pp. 185-86. See also R. Stephen Warner, 'The Place of the Congregation in the Contemporary American Religious Configuration' in *American Congregations: volume 2 New Perspectives in the Study of Congregations*, ed.by James P. Wind and James W. Lewis (Chicago, 1994), p. 73.

[46] Mark Dyer, 'Theological Reflections on the Patristic Development of Episcopal Ministry', in *On Being a Bishop* (see note 32), p. 39.

[47] Davis, op. cit., pp. 183-84, 193.

what the church needs. In this, it hearkens back to the model of the 'real, primitive bishop' that the Scottish bishops gave us in November of 1784.

An Interview with the Bishop of Swaziland

ELLINAH WAMUKOYA
Bishop of Swaziland
and
NICHOLAS TAYLOR
Rector of St Aidan's Church (Clarkston)

The Rt Revd Ellinah Wamukoya has been Bishop of Swaziland since 2012. Prior to her election, she had served as a non-stipendiary priest in the diocese, as Chaplain to the University of Swaziland. Until retirement from secular employment, she was Town Clerk and Chief Executive of the Manzini City Council. She is the first Anglican woman bishop in Africa.

The Revd Canon Dr Nicholas Taylor is Rector of St Aidan's, Clarkston. From 1995-1998 he was Lecturer in Theology and Religious Studies in the University of Swaziland, serving also as Chaplain to the University and to St Michael's School, Manzini, and as Assistant Priest at St George & St James, Manzini, where Bishop Wamukoya and her family were at the time parishioners.

NT: Bishop, thank you for agreeing to speak with us. It is for me personally a great joy to see you again. With many people around the world, we rejoiced at your election as bishop six years ago. At the time you were making history, being called to be bishop of a diocese in which patriarchal traditions have been strong and formative, in church and society, and the enormous role played by women was not always recognized. Your election symbolizes something quite transformative about God's mission in the world, but you are nevertheless called to an office that is ancient, and in which you exercise the same authority as any other bishop. Could you tell us something about that experience, what becoming a bishop has meant for you, and what your being their bishop has meant for your diocese?

Bishop: Thank you, Dr Taylor, for the interview. Being a bishop has had its joys and its challenges, but may I quickly say that the challenges have not been because I am a woman bishop; they are just normal challenges that most dioceses face. The pressure on me basically has been that I have had to work hard to ensure that things work, because even if things don't work because they were not going to work anyway, it would have been interpreted as that women have failed. That puts a lot of pressure on me to work hard. At the same time, I allow God to direct my life, I allow God to help

me to move forward because I have to remind myself continually that I am not in this role as a celebrity, but I am in this role as a servant of God, called by God at such a time as this. My successes and my failures are really dependent on how God is directing my ministry. In a nutshell, that's how I would want to explain how my ministry has been and hopefully it will continue to be.

NT: Your calling is to be a bishop in Africa, of a diocese very conscious of the need for the Gospel to be rooted and expressed in the local culture. What would you identify as distinctive characteristics of episcopal ministry in Africa?

Bishop: The episcopal ministry is like a father-head in an African setup. There has to be a father as head and leader; somebody to give direction; direction in this particular instance on where and how the church has to move forward. But then as a woman bishop, one also brings in the mother aspect. In an African setup the father is the head, but the mothers also have a big role to play. My being the bishop has brought a head who is not a father, but represents the mother aspect of leadership, into this very important ministry. What am I saying about that? While the father is there, the mother is the one who remains at home, forms the children, brings up the children, journeys with the children. Also, it doesn't end from babyhood to adulthood, it continues even beyond that: worrying, keeping in touch, wanting to know what is going on in the lives of their children. For me, that is the kind of leadership that has been brought into this church in Africa.

NT: How has your ministry as the first woman bishop in Africa changed the nature of episcopacy, and perhaps challenged the ways in which your priests exercise their ministry, and indeed your fellow bishops in the Anglican Church of Southern Africa?

Bishop: Well, maybe not necessarily changed, because the church is really still the same and there have been women priests before, but it has brought a different flavour to it, and a different perspective on ministry. Going around Africa I have been very careful how I conduct myself. I have not been throwing myself at anyone, but I've been watching and waiting to see how I am being received. As I have been continuing going around Africa, I have met quite a lot of African bishops now, and I am seeing that they are beginning to respect women leadership in the church. I have had unexpected invitations, for instance to Tanzania, without being an activist but exercising the ministry that God has called me into. I have seen interest developing in the womenfolk; they see that it can be done, that we can do it. More than being

denied the opportunity there has always been that fear, because of our patriarchal background, that women have not been coming forward to offer their ministry at that level in the church. Being around and doing ministry, people are beginning to see that it can be done by women, and I have found that I've been working very well with my African brothers including those in Southern Africa where I was accepted from the beginning.

NT: You would describe yourself as an example rather than an activist?

Bishop: Yes, I have never thought of myself as an activist, basically because I think ministry is a calling. Ministry is a calling from God. It is God's thing, it is not our thing, so I don't see how I can be an activist?

NT: What do you believe is the role of bishops in global partnerships, such as that between the dioceses of Swaziland and Brechin? How would you like to see these relationships develop?

Bishop: Brechin, Iowa and Swaziland have exchanged a lot of experiences. Sometimes we look at these relationships in financial terms, but it is not always like that. It is not always money from the rich to the poor, but there is a lot more that we can exchange through these relationships. For instance, in the way we do ministry we have enriched each other. We have received theological books which are sometimes not so obtainable in our dioceses. In 2016 Iowa, Brechin and Swaziland dioceses held a meeting in Brechin to which we brought the young people. The previous year we had had young people from Iowa and from Brechin coming to Swaziland to our Youth Conference, so we then made a return visit to Brechin. We have just been discussing with Bishop Scarfe[1] the success of this. Four or five of the young people who came to Swaziland, to Brechin, are now in ministry, active ministry. We have witnessed weddings of people who met during these visits.[2] We have enriched each other spiritually and last year each of the three bishops made presentations to the group of young people. Bishop Nigel[3] presented on the Scottish culture, on how things were being done. I presented on *sankofa* which is an Akan[4] adage for *looking back while you go forward*. Where has the church come from? Where is the church now? Where is the church going? Then looking at our different backgrounds, taking what is good from the past and taking it forward and integrating with what life is

---

[1] The Rt Revd Dr Alan Scarfe, Bishop of Iowa.
[2] Reference the son of the Bishop of Iowa.
[3] The Rt Revd Dr Nigel Peyton, Bishop of Brechin, 2011-17.
[4] One of the Ghanaian languages.

like now. Bishop Scarfe challenged us to identify that which is essential in our traditions, to preserve and to hand on to the next generation, and to share with others. So those are the rich experiences for me: that we continue to exchange ideas and enrich each other. Our spiritualities might not be expressed in the same way, but we take what is good from each other and appropriate it and something beautiful comes out of that.

NT: This opportunity for us to meet and to speak has been created by the consecration and installation of the new Bishop of Brechin. Like you, Bishop Andrew entered the ordained ministry after a distinguished secular career and has been called to be a bishop not many years later. Do you believe the gifts and experience you both bring to episcopal ministry are enriched by your experience in leadership in the world?

Bishop: Indeed, I believe in that. You might know yourself, Dr Taylor, when you were in Swaziland I was nowhere near the church leadership, and I was also called into the episcopate at a very young age in terms of my ministry in the church. I was hardly seven years into ministry, and, worse still, it was part-time, self-supporting. I always say that I was very far from the fires in the diocese. I had very limited knowledge of church leadership, but I took courage from knowing that I had been a leader most of my life in my secular job. Even before I became the town clerk, I was a departmental head, which meant most of the activities rested on my shoulders, so I brought those skills with me such as strategic planning, for instance. The first thing I did when I came to the episcopate was to develop a strategic plan for the diocese, which was to be a guide for all of us. I made sure that the strategic plan was bought into by all the parishes, because it wasn't my plan, it was the diocesan plan and we all had to buy into it and abide by it. I have done a lot of delegation; I still have the powers of office, but I am not afraid to delegate to people so that, when I leave the diocese, things don't go back, they go forward because those people will have been part and parcel of their running of the diocese.

Another thing, when I came in, people were afraid to bring in lay canons, because of notions of priesthood and confidentiality. But we must always tap into the skills that we don't have, because as priests and as pastors we don't have all the skills, we also need secular skills. So, I have sought to run the church on corporate principles, but not forgetting that we are a church. Corporate principles come with accountability. With accountability you have to have the instruments and systems in place, so I have implemented a finance policy, transport policy, leave policy, HR policy and other such policies. I find that it is really working for the church because everybody now knows where we are going. I have a training policy now for ministry, and we

all know these are instruments and systems in helping the church to function much better, and those who come after will take these over and move the church forward. So, I think my work in the secular world has really assisted me to carry out the work of God. The difference in the secular world is you don't always call on God, but in the church, whatever policy you apply, God comes first.

NT: Do you believe that your knowledge and experience of the world outside the Church changes the way in which you exercise your ministry particularly as a bishop? You have spoken about your administrative experience. Would you say that it affects your pastoral and teaching ministry as well?

Bishop: In a way it does. What I've found difficult is to play both the pastoral role and the administrative role simultaneously. It's a bit difficult in the church because while you do your administrative role you don't forget that you are a pastor. What that has done to me, is that I have felt that we have to develop other people and apply their skills: the Anglican Church, I love it because it's not like we are starting afresh, the instruments are there; you have the Canons and the regulations, but then what I have found is that we can develop other people who will carry out the administrative functions and apply the rules, and I can keep away from this aspect and concentrate on my pastoral role. Separation of roles, not trying to be everything all the time.

NT: I'm sure that many bishops would recognize the dilemmas you've mentioned there. This is a difficult time for the Anglican Communion. A generation ago, the stresses over the ordination of women disrupted the fellowship of the Communion in ways which are still being felt in some parts of the world. Nevertheless, the current tensions seem at times to be yet more threatening. Do you believe this to be the case?

Bishop: This question is a difficult one. The tensions are there, and that is a fact. I have been part of the consultative dialogue of bishops. One of the things that we have been doing in that forum is actually to deal with these tensions that are facing the church in Southern Africa. Currently we are dealing with this, and I can also see that the Province is also divided over these issues, and in particular the issues of human sexuality, but be that as it may, I believe that just as we have lived with the ordination of women, and just as I am now a bishop in the church in Africa, we can live with our differences. Safe to say, these issues are not going away, and we cannot wish them away. As far as I'm concerned, there is no winner and there is no loser when it comes to these things. Let us continue to pray. Let us continue to

discern the will of God, and then leave God to judge, because we cannot judge. However differently we see these issues, we must concentrate on the things that make us one and bring us together, not on the things that divide us. So far as I am concerned, we are still the church of God, and it is only the bridegroom, Christ, who knows how his bride, the Church, should be. My challenge is, we say, as Anglicans we reason, we are Scripture-based, we are tradition-based. For me it is a complication, how far should our reasoning go? How far should we change our tradition? How do we interpret Scripture? How we interpret the Scriptures depends on our context. You cannot change my context, I will remain who I am, and I will only be able to see the Scriptures and live according to the Scriptures as I read them in my context. So what pains me is when we try to change each other, because that is what really brings out the tensions - when we are trying to change each other. We need to find Jesus who will give us his Holy Spirit, who will then speak through us and to us, and interpret the Scriptures accordingly. It is a complicated matter, but I think the Communion is no stranger to these controversies. Even now let us continue to fight and work together as Communion and together find the will of God.

NT: Do you believe that bishops, and in particular bishops with your perspectives and experience, can play a particular role in leading the Anglican Communion through the current crisis?

Bishop: Well, I believe so. Like I've said, bishops work within their contexts. I can't influence, I can't change people's perspectives. First and foremost, I must try to work with the people of God, whom God has put into my hand, and try to be the torchbearer. For instance, I don't believe that we have to be militant about these issues. Different as we are and although we see these things in different ways it is up to us to bring unity into the church of God, rather than bringing divisions. That is where I see the role of the bishop. We meet as bishops, with our different perspectives, our different ways of seeing things, but we continue to be brothers and sisters. If we as bishops can do this together, see things differently, but still be together, we can do this for the body of Christ.

NT: The Anglican Communion is of course engaged with many issues across the world, and not just those which excite the media. How would you see the role of bishops developing in the Anglican Communion, alongside projects and networks initiated by the various Instruments of Communion, and the Anglican Communion Office in particular?

Bishop: The networks have a big role to play in the Anglican Communion. They address specific issues. For instance, the Family Network[5] addresses issues that affect families in the different parts of the Anglican Communion. A family in Scotland is different from a family in Africa, is different from a family in India, and so on and so forth. So, that network brings us together, and we can sit together and see how best as a Communion we can be there for each other, in our different environments in relation to family. I was in Lusaka for the ACC [6] and there are parts of the Communion where registration of births and deaths is still a challenge, and that network was trying to see how people can be assisted in terms of that. And then the Women's Network,[7] trying to bring up women's issues in the different parts of the Communion. Peace and Justice,[8] can we be there for each other in those areas that do not have peace, in those areas where they have governments who are oppressive, where there is war? I see a big role for the networks because it is saying that we are there for our brothers and sisters, and together we formed the Communion. So, that's what I see the role of the networks, as a way of being there for each other in addressing those specific issues. The Gospel of Christ affects a holistic human being, it's not just your spirit, but if your family is not right then you are affected. How do you worship God when things are not right in your family? How do you worship God when you feel that you are oppressed, when you feel there is no justice? So, the networks then come into place because they address the specific issues which would help us to worship God together. They do play a critical role as far as I'm concerned.

NT: And you feel it's important for bishops to be seen to be involved in those networks?

Bishop: Definitely, because bishops are figureheads. Every family will follow their leader, so if bishops stay behind, then the people of God will not see the value if their spiritual leader is not involved. God has placed bishops in that role; that they hold the staff and the sheep follow. So it is critical that as

---

[5] The International Anglican Family Network. For further information, see http://iafn.anglicancommunion.org/.

[6] Anglican Consultative Council. For further information, http://www.anglicancommunion.org/structures/instruments-of-communion/acc.aspx

[7] The International Anglican Women's Network. For further information, http://iawn.anglicancommunion.org/

[8] Anglican Peace & Justice Network. For further information, http://apjn.anglicancommunion.org/

bishops we are seen to play a role in these networks for the people of God to see their value.

NT: During the last century, the Church has faced the legacy of its divisions – divisions largely created in Europe and exported globally. The ecumenical movement has seen both considerable successes and many disappointments. What would you see as the priorities for ecumenism in the coming years?

Bishop: What I have been dealing with recently, and am currently involved in, is issues of the environment. These are issues that really cut across all of us, and it is critical that we embrace them as the body of Christ. It doesn't matter if you are a Catholic or whatever, these issues affect us in the same way. So, for me these are the priority issues that we should put our attention to, the issues that cut across us as humans. Also issues of peace and justice, they cut across all of us as the body of Christ, despite our denominations and our different churches and church structures.

NT: Thank you very much for that. I think that this is something that is very important for us to hear. We tend to be focussed on Faith and Order issues, when there are actual human issues which our Christian faith requires that we attend to, so you make a very valuable point.

Do you believe the Anglican Communion, and Anglican dioceses locally, have a particular contribution to make to the ecumenical movement?

Bishop: I believe so, for instance we have the Council of Swaziland Churches which is not just Anglicans, but also Catholics, Lutherans and Methodists, and we have been addressing issues together, hunger issues, how do we ensure that the people of Swaziland have food, we have been addressing the issues of human sexuality together as the Council of Swaziland Churches. We have been making statements together to the government on issues of peace and justice; for me that is ecumenism. Also, now we are building a national church which is not just the Council of Swaziland Churches, but it includes also the League of Swaziland Churches and the Conference of Swaziland Churches, coming together.

NT: Perhaps, for the benefit of our readers, you could explain the significance of these different groupings?

Bishop: The Conference of Swaziland Churches includes mainly the evangelical groups; the Council of Swaziland Churches is mainly the catholic groups, the churches established by overseas missionaries, and the League is the African Initiated Churches. This is how we have been grouped, but

there are times when we come together as one. For instance, we celebrate together the Somhlolo Festival of Praise, as the Christians of Swaziland, despite our groupings, for the edification of the body of Christ. Currently, there is a move to start a co-operative movement as Christians, despite our groupings. Ecumenism as far as the diocese and the people of Swaziland are concerned has a lot of advantages.

NT: And you feel that it is important for you as the bishop to be seen to be involved in those?

Bishop: Yes, of course. We have been leading the Council of Swaziland Churches, and the same thing is happening in the other groupings. The bishops are the ones who have been leading those groupings.

NT: Bishop, you are Convenor of the Anglican Communion Environmental Network,[9] in which I expect you work closely with the Rev. Dr Rachel Mash, who of course comes from Scotland and from our church. Could you tell us something of your work, and of ways in which congregations in Scotland might become more involved in it?

Bishop: One thing that has come to my mind is climate issues. Environmental issues do not respect political boundaries; they just cut across all of us. What happens in Africa is happening here; it affects all of us. If we don't look after the environment in Africa, you also will one day be affected in one way or another. If you encourage global warming this side, people living on low-lying islands and coastlands will be flooded; because of the melting of ice in Antarctica they are being drowned. Having that in mind, I believe we have to work together. The Environmental Network consists of people in America, people in India, and people here in Britain and all over the world. We are working together to try to address this monster that is facing us; a monster on which there are still those who are in denial, and yet it does exist. We, as the Anglican Communion in Southern Africa, believe that the church is the one organization that has the biggest following. If we get environmental issues across to our congregations and can educate them how climate change can be mitigated, then maybe we have addressed 60 or 70% of the population. I think it is working for us now. I believe then that it would be good for all of us to work together to address these issues. We have been writing papers back and forth. We have the sixth Season of Creation[10]

---

[9] For further information, http://acen.anglicancommunion.org/.

[10] In several Anglican Provinces, a Season of Creation is included in the church calendar. For more information, http://acen.anglicancommunion.org/resources/season-of-creation.aspx.

out already, where we have been writing sermons on land issues, waste, biodiversity, and other issues, and we exchange that information. For me one way that we can assist each other is the exchange of information. How have you done it? I have noticed since I came here very few plastics, your stirring rods for your tea have become wooden; we are drinking water from glass bottles. How have you reached there? Assist us on how to sensitize people to reach that point. In my part of the country we are very much hooked into plastic water bottles, we still think it is fashionable to drink bottled water from those plastics. We use styrofoam containers at funerals; we like to eat food, not snacks, so people dish up onto those styrofoam plates which are very difficult to dispose of. How have you done it? We have really been onto our congregations about this. I wrote a paper for my thesis on Liturgy, the Environment and the Prayer Book. How we can 'green' our liturgy. As we worship God and as we celebrate the Eucharist, we must sensitize ourselves. The bread that we break is part of the environment, so how, as Christians, do we look after the environment? Information sharing, I think, is invaluable.

NT: I think that is some information that would be very useful for us too. Our Liturgy Committee is engaged in revising our liturgies, and I think that this is something we will need to consider. I hope that we will be fed by your material.

Bishop, you have given us an enormous amount to think about and reflect upon, as we consider the patterns of ministry, and in particular the episcopal ministry in our Church for the future years. Thank you very much for your time, and it has been a great joy to share this time together after all these years.

The End of Bishops?

FRANCIS BRIDGER
Rector of St Mary's Church (Broughty Ferry) and Dean of Brechin

How should we understand the purpose of bishops? This is the underlying teleological question that runs through the series of essays contained in this Winter issue of the *SEI Journal*. Moreover, it is an existential question that presses hard upon us. For at this juncture in its history the Scottish Episcopal Church stands at a decisive moment, and the role of the bishops in offering leadership – both individually and collectively – will be critical in determining not just the shape of the Church's future, but, more fundamentally, whether the SEC will exist in any significant form at all thirty years from now.

The creeping – now rapid – secularisation of the last thirty years has reached a point where it threatens to overwhelm all mainstream Christian denominations. The SEC is not immune from this cultural shift, as evidence from the 2016 Scottish Church Census demonstrates: In 1984, there were 20,000 Episcopalians attending church on Sundays. By 2002, there were 18,870 – only a slight drop. But by the time of the 2016 census, the total had fallen to 13,380 – a collapse of 29% in just 14 years.[1] The Church is dangerously near to a point from which there can be no return – the so-called 'cliff edge' or 'inflection point' scenario.[2]

It is clear that this cannot carry on if there is to be a Scottish Episcopal Church in anything but name by the middle of the century. This is the context in which the question of the role and authority of bishops becomes not only timely but imperative.

The Scottish Episcopal answer to the question with which we began has historically focussed on a bishop's sacerdotal-pastoral role, as David Jasper and Nicholas Taylor have pointed out. This sacramental-pastoral model persists today, as both have made clear. From the standpoint of the wider Anglican tradition, however, this is not the end of the story. Richard Hooker, perhaps the most famous of the Anglican founding fathers, identified the true distinctiveness of bishops in their 'power of order'. That is to say, that while bishops share with other priests the power to administer Word and Sacrament, what marks them out *as bishops* is their authority to ordain and discipline – what Hooker called 'that power which belongeth

---

[1] Brierley, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

[2] See Peter Brierley, *Growth Amidst Decline: What the 2016 Scottish Church Census Reveals* (Tonbridge: ADBC Publishers, 2017).

unto jurisdiction'.[3] As he sees it, 'the power of ordaining both deacons and presbyters, the power to give the power of order unto others, this also hath been always peculiar unto bishops'.[4]

At first sight, Hooker's point may seem obvious. But in the context of post-Reformation Anglicanism, Hooker's insistence that bishops by virtue of their being priests at one and the same time, contained a radical seed that is relevant to our situation today. For alongside his emphasis on 'jurisdiction' must be set his view that although hierarchically ordered in terms of jurisdictional authority, bishops and priests are equal in their calling as ministers of Word and Sacrament. They participate in this shared vocation not in a relationship ordered by a bishop-priest hierarchy but as those who have been called and gifted by God to priestly ministry *per se*.

Episcopacy, therefore, on Hooker's account, must be seen as a collegial structure, so that there exists 'No cause why the Bishop should disdain to consult with them [priests], and in the weighty affairs of the Church to use their advice.'[5]

It would, of course, be anachronistic to draw a straight line between Hooker and modern synodical government. Nonetheless, Hooker's *principle of shared vocation*, if extended to include the entire *laos* of God, offers a grounding for the Church's governance that goes beyond appeals to post-Enlightenment democratic principles to a *theological* understanding of collegiality that derives from God's calling to the Church as a whole.

When we ask what bishops are for, then, we must recognize the implications that flow from Hooker's argument. The role of bishops (and synods for that matter) is not in the first instance to be legislators and problem-solvers (although both of these functions will be necessary) but to *hear and respond to the call of God for the sake of the Church*. To follow through Oliver O'Donovan's point, episcopal leadership is not principally a matter of managerial organization but a listening to the Spirit in a collegial relationship with others.

---

[3] Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, VII.vi.1. https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/923 (accessed 30 November 2018). It should also be noted that when Hooker spoke of jurisdiction, he did not have in mind the 'business of organisational administration but primarily the administration of discipline under the Word of God – a 'spiritual' function...' Richard A. Norris Jr, 'Episcopacy' in *The Study of Anglicanism* (revised edition), ed. by Stephen Sykes, John Booty and Jonathan Knight (London: SPCK 1998), p. 336.

[4] Hooker, *op. cit.,* VII.vi.3.

[5] Hooker*, op. cit.,* VII.vi.1.

This means that amidst the welter of legislative demands, canonical revisions, and policy determinations that fill every synodical agenda, there must be a clear and deep understanding on the part of all that the business of administration and management is a *spiritual* business. The metaphor offered in Genesis 1 of the Spirit of God 'hovering over' is apposite.

In enabling the Church's organizational and decision-making bodies to understand themselves in this way, the bishops are crucial. They have a determinative role in leading the Church in those 'spiritual practices' which must inhabit not just the formal liturgies of the Church but its heart and mind as well. By teaching and modelling them, bishops uniquely can offer this gift. Who else can do so with the kind of authority, formal and spiritual, that bishops alone possess?[6]

We cannot stop here, however. For the decline of Christianity in general and of Episcopalianism in particular has injected into the traditional priestly-pastoral model of episcopacy a further expectation that bishops must also be 'agents of mission'. Noting that this was 'explored at some depth at the 1998 Lambeth Conference', the 2004 report *mission-shaped church* [no capitals] spoke unequivocally of the bishop's role as 'missionary, focus of unity and guardian of the faith', adding that 'the role of the bishop as leader in mission is crucial...' [7] From this, the notion of 'bishops-in-mission' has become commonplace.

But what does the Church – and therefore its bishops – understand mission to be? Without such an understanding, the notion of 'bishops-in-mission' runs the risk of becoming little more than a slogan or virtue signifier. How bishops conceptualize their missionary role is consequently not just a

---

[6] It is worth observing at this point that Max Weber delineated three types of authority: (a) traditional/customary; (b) legal-institutional; and (c) charismatic. The authority of Scottish bishops clearly can be located in the first of these through the notion of apostolic succession, or even simple historical continuity of office; and in the second through the mechanism of election enshrined in canon law. Type (c) is more problematic since it implies an outstanding character who by sheer personality and will is able to carry the Church with him/her. As Weber noted, the influence of charismatic figures is likely to be short-lived and therefore temporary, after which authority relocates to (a) or (b). In any case, the Christian virtue of humility combined with a theology of servant leadership tends to work against investing individuals with an overmighty sense of charismatic self. Nonetheless, it is in their *collective* leadership that charismatic authority can be exercised since the corporate sum is more than the individual parts.

[7] Archbishops' Council, *mission-shaped church* (London: Church House Publishing, 2004), pp. 101, 135.

matter of their own self-understanding: it is inextricably linked to the way in which the Church sees its own missionary calling. At present, I suspect that many Episcopalians think of mission as a synonym for membership drive, in which the bishop-in-mission is seen as a kind of recruitment officer-cum-sales-representative responsible for developing strategies to win new members and thereby sustain the institution for its own sake.

Given the challenges of decline outlined above, it is not surprising that mission might be thought of in this way. But to view it thus cannot be allowed to stand; for on any theory of mission the pragmatics of boosting membership is not the primary task. Herein, then, lies an opportunity for bishops to fulfil their dual role of teacher and missionary leader. For the College of Bishops – acting together in the kind of concert for which Oliver O'Donovan has eloquently pleaded – to lead the Church into an understanding of what it means to be a missionary Church would unequivocally demonstrate that the Church was serious about its vocation and at the same time bring together the proclamatory and teaching roles which bishops have publicly accepted at the moment of their consecration.

The acceptance of this teaching role would therefore decisively answer the question of episcopal purpose. In the first place, it would provide a clear counterpoint to the criticism that 'the managerial model' has come to dominate expectations of episcopal leadership. Secondly, in clarifying their own thinking and developing a programme of teaching *that they would carry out themselves* the bishops would necessarily want to draw upon the wider theological expertise that Oliver O'Donovan rightly notes is available. In doing so, they might start not with the traditional entry points of systematic theology and biblical studies, but with the insights offered by missiology. It was, after all, the Edinburgh 1910 Missionary Conference that is widely regarded as marking a turning point both in missiological and ecumenical affairs,[8] and which has led in the intervening century to a wealth of reflective theory and practice crying out to be used in contemporary Scotland.

Thirdly, by offering this kind of leadership the bishops would offer a centre of gravity for the Church different from its current bureaucratic paradigm. To be sure, in all fairness the General Synod some years ago framed (after much to-ing and fro-ing between committees, working parties, sub-groups and the like) a policy for Whole Church Mission and Ministry. But this has all but collapsed under the weight of inertia and lack of local support (or even understanding in many cases). It has been a classic example of structural disconnect. By contrast, an episcopal initiative that originated

---

[8] As one commentator noted at its centenary in 2010, rightly or wrongly the Conference 'has often been described as the beginning of the modern ecumenical movement.'

from the College of Bishops and which was the direct responsibility of the College both in its conception and its delivery would signal a clear commitment to the mission-shaped role inherent in episcope.[9]

What might hinder bishops from acting collectively and individually as 'bishops-in-mission'? Interestingly, the issue was addressed by a working party set up by the Anglican Consultative Council as far back as 1992. Its report is instructive:

From the beginning, the Bishop was to be prophet and model of life in Christ, focus of unity, pastor of the pastors and teacher of the teachers (both ordained and lay). Augustine of Canterbury, for example, was a leader in mission. But over the centuries these functions have been overlaid and even thwarted by other responsibilities. How then might our Bishops be set free to be what the church's mission calls them to be?[10]

The language is telling in two ways: firstly, the report is clear that bishops must occupy a prophetic as well as pastoral-sacerdotal role. This is, perhaps, a late twentieth century/early twenty-first century perspective created by the inequalities thrown up by a combination of post-colonialism, late capitalism and globalization, for we could not be further from the apostolic or Hookerian traditions. But if this is the case, to be prophetic will require a thoughtful understanding of the world as well as the Church. To be prophets, bishops will need to speak boldly and challengingly to unjust social structures and policies, which in turn will require an understanding of contemporary society, cultural trends and critical theological method made possible only if the bishops are released to do the necessary intellectual work.

Secondly, it is instructive that the authors speak of 'functions overlaid', 'thwarted responsibilities' and the need for bishops to be 'set free'. Significantly, the report goes on to speak of 'the inappropriate use of a corporate style of business management' as a major factor in holding back bishops from their missional calling. Reading this critique, it is perhaps hauntingly reassuring that the modern SEC is clearly not unique. But the

---

[9] This, of course, begs the question of what we might understand by mission. But this underlines the importance of the bishops developing their collective understanding as a precursor to leading the Church in its own.

[10] The Mission Issues and Strategy Advisory Group II, *Towards Dynamic Mission: renewing the Church for mission* (*1992).* http://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/108019/Mission-Commissions-MISAG-II.pdf (accessed 5 November 2018).

starkness of the analysis and the fact that the same kind of criticisms can be heard today make it urgent that the roadblocks that prevent bishops from acting prophetically and missionally (the two are inextricably bound together) are demolished.

What then needs to happen for the Church 'to liberate her bishops in mission'? *Towards Dynamic Mission* advances a number of proposals:

1. 'the reassigning of some tasks to others gifted in ministry in the Body of Christ. This will involve the Bishop intentionally empowering others, especially lay people'
2. 'priority given to time set aside for [the bishop's] learning, reading, reflection, prayer'
3. 'adequate time for rest, recreation, days off, holidays'
4. 'and most importantly for some, renewal that will energize and inspire'

Few bishops, in the SEC or probably elsewhere, would take issue with any of these recommendations. Certainly, the first is already a *sine qua non* both in principle and in practice as far as Scotland is concerned. It is the remaining three that perpetually prove the most problematic. For in the end, the expectations placed upon bishops and their diaries make (2), (3) and (4) almost impossible to fulfil.

If bishops are to lead in mission, as well as all the other things, it is only from within the structures and culture of the SEC that a solution will be found. This is ironic because the requirements imposed by these structures and expectations (and admittedly accepted by the bishops) are themselves at the heart of the problem. It is episcopal overload and external expectations, rather than episcopal desire, that push bishops towards a managerial model of ministry.

The solution, of course, must be to overturn technocratic expectations of bishops as managers-cum-problem-solvers so that they can be released to be the spiritual leaders they wish (and are charged) to be: in other words, to fulfil the vocation to which they have been called. But the corollary of this is that resources must be released to enable them to do so. Since this will require money, the Church must take seriously the Hookerian notion of collegiality to make possible the reality of a mission-shaped church led by bishops-in-mission. The Church cannot will the end (missional bishops, spiritual leadership, less managerialism) without also willing the means. Only by a readiness to recognize the financial and moral responsibility entailed by the sort of episcopacy envisaged by *Towards Dynamic Mission* will the Church bring about the cultural revolution necessary to liberate bishops to be what they *must* be.

Afterword

DAVID JASPER
Convener, Doctrine Committee of the Faith and Order Board of the Scottish Episcopal Church
and
Professor Emeritus of Theology and Literature (University of Glasgow)

These essays and interview make no claims to be either definitive or conclusive. Indeed, within them the various authors have made no attempt to iron out differences. They are offered at a time when the nature of episcopacy within the universal Church and particularly within the Scottish Episcopal Church is debated and lies at the very heart of our identity as a Christian community. These discussions are only a beginning, as they lead necessarily to wider ecclesiological questions on the very nature of Church, and within it the theology and nature of ministry.

The current events in the process of episcopal election within the Scottish Episcopal Church perhaps reflect upon these wider issues in times of change and challenge. For some people the continuing shrinkage of numbers and charges in every diocese suggests that the future of the very being of the Scottish Episcopal Church is bleak. We suggest that a better way of thinking about this is reflection upon the nature of God's calling to His Church in times of radical changes in our society as a whole. In such reflections the role of the bishop is central.

The Church has always lived within the context of changes in society – through times of persecution to times of seeming affluence. Today we are challenged to uphold the nature of truth in Christ in a world in which powerful figures hold the truth in scant regard, with all the consequent threat to morality and peaceful order. At no time has the challenge been greater. We have emphasized that the bishop is one who is called by God to a particular role of leadership. Being reminded of this, we need also to reflect deeply upon the calling of the whole Church and our duty as Christians to be attentive to that call and to be ever wary of the dangers of quarrels amongst ourselves, vain ambition or party politics, all of which diminish our ability to listen, prayerfully, to the voice of God.

Book Review

DAVID M. BERTIE. *The Heraldry of the Bishops of Scotland*. Illustrated by John
   Hamilton Gaylor (Edinburgh: *Heraldic Society of Scotland*, 2018). 342
   pp. ISBN 9781999979409.

David M. Bertie is a scholar-historian of the Scottish Episcopal Church. His
great and indispensable volume on *Scottish Episcopal Clergy, 1689-2000* is
the *vade mecum* of anyone who has the slightest interest in the history of the
congregations and clergy in Scotland. Now he has produced a companion
and richly illustrated volume *The Heraldry of the Bishops of Scotland*, though
this volume is not restricted to the post-Revolution Episcopal Church; it
stretches back beyond the Reformation to medieval times, and also includes
the later Roman Catholic bishops.

Heraldry is the art and science of coats of arms. It has an ancient
history, and is very popular in today's Scotland, where uniquely its
governance is legally and carefully looked after by the Lord Lyon and the
Lyon Court. Legally in Scotland coats of arms are personal to the owner and
are not 'family arms' as in England and elsewhere. Today, some people have
inherited their arms from a grant made to their family in the past; others use
a version of such arms; but a large number of people have grants made of
new arms. The charges and elements in these new arms usually reflect some
aspect of the owner's character, life and interests. Their combinations of
colour are an added pleasure, making them often very decorative as well.

Ecclesiastical arms are interesting too, and each of the Scottish
Episcopal Church dioceses has its own design, very familiar to people as they
are depicted on our 'pub' signs that hang outside every church. Theses
diocesan arms were regularised some sixty years ago, but the arms of two
dioceses, Edinburgh and Argyll, date from the time when the Church of
Scotland was Episcopal and are a visible sign that the Episcopal Church is no
new and exotic plant in Scotland, but in a legal continuity with the ancient
national church in our land. It is heartening that the Episcopal dioceses and
bishops use their arms so often. Long may they continue!

Bertie's book is principally about those Scottish bishops who used
coats of arms and suggests family arms that others, in the past, might have
used, but for which there is no record. He throws a lot of light on the people
who have been appointed or elected bishops in Scotland since the thirteenth
century, including cardinals, archbishops, college bishops and vicars
apostolic, with short descriptions of what each of these titles mean. Some of
the bishops moved from Scottish dioceses to the Church of Ireland; others
came to Scotland from the Church of England. One interesting inclusion is

Bishop Beckles who was bishop in Scotland for those Anglicans [Church of England in Scotland] who would not accept the jurisdiction of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

After the Reformation it became the custom for the arms of diocesan bishops to 'marry' their dioceses, and on one side, the left [called 'dexter'] was their diocese and on the right, [called 'sinister'] their personal arms. The arms in the nave of St John's church, Edinburgh, show this clearly, and even have blanks on one side if the bishop was not using personal arms. Generally, however, until recent times, bishops have used arms associated with their family name, rather than registering them in their own name. Now the practice has changed, and the Roman Catholic bishops all take out personal arms, while the Scottish Episcopal bishops do not use personal arms at all, using the diocesan arms alone, with a mitre. There are exceptions, and three recent bishops of Brechin, John Sprott, Edward Luscombe and Nigel Peyton, have each registered personal arms.

It is remarkable that in the darkest times of persecution of the Scottish Episcopal Church in the eighteenth century, the bishops used arms, as for instance on the seals that they placed on the letters of orders that they issued to those ordained. Bertie has researched and recorded these seals all over the country, finding various previously un-noticed examples.

As the Lord Lyon pointed out at the launch of this sumptuous book, it is strange that at a time when new heraldry has never been more popular among the general public of Scotland, with a larger number of people seeking arms than ever before, and when every Roman Catholic bishop in Scotland has received personal grants of arms, yet none of the present bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church have arms. It would be invidious to question why this should be, but clearly they are on a counter-cultural route!

ALLAN MACLEAN
Rector of St Vincent's Chapel (Edinburgh)