

*The Journal*  
of  
**The Church of England  
(Continuing)**

*Jesus Christ the same  
yesterday, and today,  
and forever. Heb. 13:8*



**Issue No: 9**  
**October 1998**

The Association of the Continuing Church Trust. Registered Charity Number 1055010

*From Presiding Bishop David N. Samuel*

81, Victoria Road  
Devizes,  
Wiltshire  
SN10 1EU

Dear Friends,

You may have wondered why the logo of a mountain was chosen to decorate the front of the **Journal** of the Church of England (Continuing). Some may think it is because we have a mountain to climb! It is indeed true; we face a very stiff challenge in these difficult days. To stand for the truth is not easy. The broad way, which is easy to enter and follow, is thronged with people, the narrow way is deserted. But that is not the reason we have chosen this logo. The words alongside the logo are “Jesus Christ the same, yesterday, today and for ever” (Hebrews 13: 8). We have chosen the symbol of a mountain for its stability and continuity. “Thy righteousness is like the great mountains,” says the psalmist, representing the truth about God himself, that He is unchanging and his Word is unchanging. The Lord says to His people, “I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed” (Malachi 3: 6). Our trust is in the name of the Lord, and only as we adhere to his unchanging Word are we safe. That alone stands above the flux and change of the world, which is ‘ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth’ (2 Timothy 3: 7).

One of the things we have adhered to is the three-fold ministry of bishops, priests and deacons, and I have written about this, and why we hold to it, more fully elsewhere in this edition of the **Journal**, especially in view of the consecration of the Reverend Edward Malcolm to the episcopate on the 13th of September. (We pray for God’s blessing upon him and Olive and their family). Indeed, what we seek as a church to do, and our constitution makes this abundantly clear, is to adhere faithfully to the whole body of truth that we hold in the formularies of the Church of England - its 39 Articles, Prayer Book, and ministry. We believe this to be the most effective way to carry over the truth of the Gospel to the next generation. If the national church had not itself departed in such a radical manner from its own foundations, we would have felt no need for the Church of England (Continuing). Our whole aim was to further the true interests of the national church. But when that was made impossible by the constitutional change in 1993, we were left with no other course but that we are now pursuing. And in the circumstances, we believe we are still doing what is in the best

interests of the Church of England as a whole, for we are bearing witness to the things for which it ought to stand, alongside it and in spite of itself. If the General Synod would admit that it was wrong, and revoke the constitutional change it made in 1993, by admitting women to the ministry, contrary to the plain teaching of Scripture, we would be very happy to reunite with it. But as things stand, that would seem very unlikely, and so we must continue faithful to the truth and obedient to the Word of God. In this way we feel we can best serve our day and generation, and indeed, as I have said, serve the best interests of the Church of England. We are its best friends, though for a time we may be looked upon as its enemies by many.

Sometimes, people who do not understand the situation, may accuse us of schism, by dividing the church and stirring up trouble. They have not thought very deeply about the matter if they think like that, and our answer must be that of Elijah to Ahab, when Ahab accused the prophet of being a “troubler in Israel”. Elijah replied to the king: “I have not troubled Israel; but thou and thy father’s house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim”. Those who really are the troublers of the church and create division are not those who faithfully adhere to the truth and uphold the constitution of the Church of England, as we do in the Church of England (Continuing), but those who depart from its doctrines and prayer Book and introduce teachings and worship that are not according to the Word of God.

We have a mountain to climb, it is true, in these difficult days. But we also have a mountain of unchanging truth on our side, which cannot be shaken.

Yours in Christ Jesus our Saviour,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Samuel". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial 'D'.

David Samuel

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE C of E (C) - SATURDAY 3<sup>rd</sup> JULY  
1999 AT NORTH NIBLEY.**

Details will appear in the January 1999 Journal

# WHY BISHOPS?

David Samuel

**The Church of England at the Reformation chose to retain the three-fold ministry, that is, bishops, priests (or presbyters) and deacons.** Other churches such as the Church of Scotland and the Reformed Church in France did not retain bishops. The reason given in the Ordinal for the retention of bishops in the Church of England runs as follows:

*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 Christ's Church. Bishops, priests and deacons.*

The English Reformers valued these orders of ministry because they were long established and beneficial to the Church of God. They did not claim that they were necessary to the church, for in doing that they would be unchurching those who had adopted different forms of ministry. But they claimed that though episcopacy was not of the *esse* of the church, that is, not necessary to its being, it was necessary to its *bene esse*, the well-being of the church, and therefore not lightly to be set aside.

In approaching this subject we must first examine the claim of the English Reformers, that from the time of the apostles there have been these three orders in the church: bishops, priests and deacons.

## Early Church

First, Sir William Ramsey, in his book, '*The Church in the Roman Empire before 70 AD.*' sees the organisation of the church and its ministry developing in parallel to the Roman organisation of the state, not consciously imitating the state, but deriving from it those skills in administration that made it so efficient. The world-wide nature of the Christian church, even from the earliest times, required communication between the different countries, and those who guided the communication between them played a decisive part in framing the organisation.

The critical stage in this development came when Jerusalem was destroyed in 70 AD and the notion of a localised centre of Christianity was obliterated. This made it clear that the centralisation of the church could

only reside in an idea, viz. the process of inter-communication should be facilitated. It was necessary to appoint someone to the task. The word *episcopos* means ‘overseer’. When the deliberative council of elders in the local church resolved to perform some action, they appointed one of their number to superintend it. Any presbyter might be thus appointed an overseer for an occasion. It was natural that proved aptness and power in an individual presbyter should lead to his having executive duties frequently assigned to him. The tried *episcopos* therefore tended to become permanent, and to concentrate executive duties in his hands. The process was gradual. What began as an *ad hoc* appointment of a presbyter for a particular function gradually turned into a permanent office. We can see here *in embryo* the scheme of ministry that was to come to maturity in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Century, and which eventually finds expression in the writing of Ignatius Bishop of Antioch circa 110 - 117. He was deeply touched by the deputation that visited him from the churches. He realised the power that a united church might exercise, and he saw that still closer organisation through the further recognition of the bishop’s authority was needed. The episcopal authority was to him the centre of order and the guarantee of unity in the church. He insists that other bishops should guide the community.

So we see a development taking place in the apostolic and sub-apostolic periods, when certain presbyters were assigned particular duties of oversight. This is the reason why *presbuteros* is sometimes interchangeable with *episcopos*. But gradually these duties came to be associated with a particular presbyter, so that the function of *episcopos* became an office in the church. The ordinal, therefore, is right in affirming that from the apostles’ time there have been three orders of ministers in Christ’s church, bishops, priests and deacons. This embryonic structure, present in the apostles’ time, became fully fledged in the sub-apostolic period.

### Other Authors

This position is borne out by other authors. For example, K. S. Latourette in his *History of Christianity,* states that no central administration existed at first in the early church for knitting together the many local units into a single articulated structure. But “*before the first century of its existence was out the church began to display certain organised features which developed and have persisted with modifications into the twentieth century. We hear of offices and officials. Prominent among them were 1] deacons (from the Greek word diaconos meaning a servant or minister), 2] elders (the English*

*translation of the Greek presbuteros, from which the word presbyter is derived, and from which in turn comes the word priest), and 3] bishops (from the Greek episcopos with something of the meaning of overseer or superintendent)."*

The office of deacon originated in Acts 6. The office of presbyter was probably suggested by the organisation of the synagogue, and bishop was used for a time interchangeably with presbyter. Uniformity of structure did not come into being at once, but in the second century the picture began to change. We hear of what soon became an accepted pattern, a bishop governing a particular church, and of at least one bishop, that of the church at Antioch, acting as though it were an acknowledged right to address himself with authority to the other churches.

We may add to these accounts that of the learned authors of the "*Tutorial Prayer Book*", Neal and Willoughby. They wrote "*The ministry of the Church of England expressly connects itself with the ministry of the New Testament and the primitive Church*". "*As regards the method of ordination ... it would be fairly claimed that from the example of the apostles it was by the laying on of hands with prayer. So far as the three-fold ministry is concerned, it is noteworthy that the Ordinal does not speak of 'ordaining' but of 'consecrating' bishops, the identity of 'presbyters' and 'bishops' in the New Testament being generally recognised. The three names were all Scriptural.*" The 'deacon' of the Pastoral Epistles is obviously an inferior order of minister, the 'bishop' being the superior, and St. Paul's language suggests that the deacon might be expected to be promoted.

In the New Testament the bishop and presbyter are mentioned together. *Episcopos* means 'overseer'. In Acts XX presbyters are mentioned and are later called bishops. In Titus 1: 5 - 8, Titus is bidden to ordain elders and St Paul proceeds to guide him in the choice by describing the qualifications of bishops. **Therefore by some presbyters were given the office of overseer or superintendent. Some presbyters, if not all, were called bishop.**

So though at first sight it might appear that in the New Testament all presbyters were bishops and vice versa, yet this is not the case. **What is signified is that some presbyters were also called bishops, because of the special oversight that was committed to them, and with the disappearance of the apostles and the apostolic men the office of bishop or overseer grew in importance for the church and its organisation to fulfil a pastoral need.**

## Episcopacy Beneficial

Therefore episcopacy while of the *bene esse* of the church is not of the *esse*. Those churches of the Reformation which in seeking reformation were constrained by circumstances to abandon episcopacy did well, but those churches which in the course of the reformation retained episcopacy did better. Richard Hooker wrote of this situation:

*Although I see that certain Reformed Churches - the Scottish Especially and the French - have not that which best agreeth with the Sacred Scripture - I mean the government that is by bishops, inasmuch as both these Churches have fallen under a different kind of regimen; which to remedy it is for the one altogether too late, and too soon for the other during the present affliction and trouble; this their defect and imperfection I had rather lament in such case than exagitate, considering that men, oftentimes without any fault of their own, may be driven to want that kind of polity or regimen which is best, and to content themselves with that which is either the irremediable error of former times or the necessity of the present hath cast upon them. (Eccles. Pol. III vi 16).*

The Church of England in retaining episcopacy at the Reformation did not intend thereby to condemn those sister churches who were at that time differently circumstanced, and as a result took a different course and dispensed with bishops. However, whilst the Church of England does not regard bishops as necessary, it regards episcopacy as a venerable form of government which has greatly benefited the church, and in retaining it considers that it has retained something which is both beneficial and important to the well-being of the church, to its unity strength and peace.

This distinction between the bishops being of the *bene esse* not the *esse* of the church is brought out clearly in the Ordinal. The direction for the ordering of deacons and priests states that there shall be a sermon declaring how *necessary* these orders are in the Church of Christ, not simply for the Church of England. For these orders a divine obligation is claimed. But there is no similar direction for the consecration of bishops and therefore no similar claim is made at that point.

We have traced out the nature of the Christian ministry from apostolic times to its final development and we have seen the justification for the claims made in the Ordinal and why the Church of England chose to

retain the three-fold ministry of bishops, priests and deacons. In the course of the churches history the office of bishop, to say nothing of that of priest, has been overlaid and distorted with accretions of one kind or another. Bishops have been servants of kings and emperors, and sometimes lords over them, surrounded by wealth, worldly pomp and power. These developments are to be regretted. They have nothing to do with the real nature of the office of bishop, which as Augustine said, is one of labour not honour. Many other things have been corrupted and misused in the history of the church, but that is not an argument for dispensing with them altogether, but rather for reforming them and bringing them back to their original pattern.

### **Apostolic Succession**

I want now to say a word about the concept of *apostolic succession*, which is associated by some with the notion of episcopacy. Roman Catholics and Anglo-Catholics claim that the bishops are ‘the successors of the apostles’ and carry a similar power and authority in the church. This claim in the Church of Rome finds expression in the idea that the Pope is the successor of Peter. But as Luther jested, “Where is it written that the Pope is Peter, except in Rome on some chimney with coal?”. However, since they regard Peter as the chief apostle and the Pope as his successor, they claim that the pope has authority to define doctrine, and that his utterances *ex cathedra* become part of the sacred deposit of truth to be received by the faithful.

Newman attempted to revive the doctrine of apostolic succession in the Church of England in the first half of the nineteenth century. In the first of the *Tracts for the Times* he called the bishops the successors of the apostles, and spoke of “apostolic descent”.

*The Lord Jesus Christ gave His Spirit to His apostles, they in turn laid their hands on those who should succeed them; And these again on others; and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present Bishops.*

Luther exposed the Achilles heel of the doctrine of apostolic succession in his jest that I have just quoted. Where is it written? Where in Scripture is it to be found, that the apostles conferred their office upon any successors? The answer is, nowhere. It was impossible for them to do so, since their apostleship was unique and peculiar to them and they could have



no successors. An important part of the definition of an apostle was that he was an eye witness of the risen Lord. Paul refers to himself as the last, as well as the least, of the apostles, as one born out of due time, since he was not one of the twelve who had been with Jesus. But he had seen the risen Lord and he had commissioned him to be an apostle to the Gentiles. On this understanding, then, that apostles must be eye witnesses of the risen Lord they can, by definition, have no successors. Nor can they, properly speaking have any successors with regard to their universal commission to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. Bishops do not qualify in this sense either.

If there is to be any apostolic success, any continuation of the witness and testimony of the apostles today in the church it is not in terms of persons or offices, but in the Holy Scriptures which contain the apostles' doctrine and their testimony to Jesus Christ. That is the sacred deposit of truth committed to the church, and where there is a ministry that is faithful to the Scriptures you have the apostolic witness maintained. In this the Reformers of the English Church were agreed that the succession that really mattered was not one of persons and places, but of doctrine and faith. If the Bishops are faithful in that, they stand in the only succession that really matters in the church and in the sight of God.

---

## NEWS OF THE CHURCHES

**Former Congregation of St. John the Baptist with St. Mary-Le-Port, Bristol.** Morning Prayer is held every Lordis Day, except for the periodic visits by Dr. Samuel to celebrate Holy Communion. Monthly Bible Studies are held in the home of Mrs. Hodges. The congregation are encouraged by various visitors. In July we were visited by Dr. and Frau Bräumer. Dr. Bräumer is Pastor and Director of an Evangelical Lutheran Village Complex for mentally handicapped people near Hanover. He gave a short, and most interesting, account of this ministry.

**St. John's, South Wimbledon.** Mr. Pavlos Karageorgi, a friend and helper of the South London congregation is an evangelist among the Greeks. London has a large Greek community which is predominantly Greek Orthodox. Pavlos who is himself a convert from Orthodoxy is well placed to serve in this ministry. The Greek Evangelical fellowship meet in the

premises of Tollington Park Baptist Church on the second Lord's Day of each month at 4 p.m. Please pray for this work. Pavlos is available to preach and to give a lecture on his work.

**St. Mary's Castle Street, Reading.** At age 14, Richard Mortimer travelled to Norfolk for the 10 day Crusader 'Technical Hobbies' holiday. Towards the end, he asked how to become a Christian, to which he was told, "Ask Jesus into your heart." The whole family soon started going to Greyfriars church in Reading.

Right through the sixth form, University and his early working career, Richard considered himself to be a Christian, sporadically reading his Bible with occasional visits to church. The, aged 29, he was invited to a private Christian Houseparty, run by the Allmand-Smith family at their property in Llanfairfechan, North Wales. He was greatly convicted under the powerful preaching, and started to see his own sinfulness before a holy God and considered that, possibly, he had never been a Christian at all. Suddenly it all became a lot clearer, and he saw his need of salvation, and to turn from his sin in repentance and faith.

From now on Richard's thoughts increasingly turned to ministering the Gospel of free grace to needy sinners. He was constantly hearing or reading words about the great need of men who will preach. One speaker said, "God wants your youth!" "If God wants you he will have you," he was told! Richard remembered that it was God speaking to him about his great sinfulness and the free gift of new life in Christ Jesus, through the powerful preaching of the Gospel, that had caused him, after so long considering himself a Christian, to be properly born again. Preaching the Gospel is the fundamental task of the church, so why had he not heard the truth until he was aged 29, despite having significant periods of attendance at least 3 churches and 3 study groups? Finally Richard realised that God was indeed calling him, and He confirmed it for him by marvellously providing the needed support.

St Mary's celebrates it's 200th Anniversary this December. We have organised a programme of events which will include a Bible Exhibition, an illustrated talk, various musical events, special services, and more.

**If you want more information, about locations, dates and times, speakers, and so on, please contact Rev. Edward J. Malcolm on 0118 959 5131**

We would value prayer for this event.

## DARWIN'S BLACK BOX

*The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution.*

**Michael J. Behe, Associate Professor of Biochemistry at Lehigh University, USA. Hardback, 307 pp. Publisher, The Free Press. Obtainable from the Metropolitan Tabernacle Bookshop, Elephant & Castle London SE1 6SD. Price not given.**

Two men challenged the unbelief of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century. One, the scientifically widely read Ven. William Paley, Archdeacon of Carlisle, published his *Natural Theology*, demonstrating that the complex design of living things requires there to be a Maker. The other was the Oxford Don, the Rev. John Wesley, turned hedge-preacher (a term of abuse). Wesley, with Whitefield, is generally taken even on a human plane, to have saved Britain from a bloody and godless French-style revolution. Paley influenced few.

Behe updates Paley's flawed argument that a watch (design) can only be the product of a watchmaker (Designer), which lay open to evolution's reply that complex apparent design can be the product of chance. Ah, says Behe, but irreducible complexity is what Paley ought to have kept to, and not been sidetracked into non-essentials. Behe is an excellent and humourous writer, a gifted exponent, and one who makes easy such a labyrinthine subject, that only those with minds like university professors could otherwise hope to understand it. He argues not for the Bible, but for an Ultimate Cause, called 'God'. It is safe to say Behe, an RC, will never overturn the godlessness of our age. The Spirit filled preaching of the Cross alone has that power.

He challenges evolutionists to answer one argument: *irreducible complexity*. "To Darwin, then, as to every other scientist of his time, the cell was a black box". Indeed that great disciple of Darwin, Ernst Haeckel, also living in the age of the microscope, called the cell "a simple little lump of albuminous combination of carbon". Since that time Electron microscopy has made it possible to examine very much smaller structures than was possible under a microscope. The examination of amino acids, which are the 'building blocks' of proteins, required a yet further advance, that of X-ray crystallography, mathematically interpreted. Patience led eventually to the discovery of DNA and the birth of modern biochemistry. Since then, with the advent of "NMR [nuclear magnetic resonance] a molecule can be studied while in solution". Thus "the cell - Darwin's black box - stands open".

The cell's components are not just more complicated than Darwin supposed. Complexity alone might conceivably have evolved. But they are so dependent on highly integrated processes, that none could operate unless that whole were in place; certainly not by chance selection of the fittest one to do the next stage in the task. The reason for this is because the whole interlinked and convoluted process of the inner workings of the fundamental unit of life, the cell, is indivisible - take away any part, and the rest have no reason to have existed, because they do not fulfil any function. He demonstrates this from various parts and processes of the human body, and even though he deliberately simplifies the interwoven complexities, it is still a problem to follow him. So he writes in a manner to allow these passages to be skipped without spoiling the argument - very clever. A 'simple' origin, advancing by 'natural selection' of the fittest component workings, to form a complex process, in theory might be possible, but when it comes to the vastly complex changes evolution requires, this strains credulity far past breaking-point. Behe compares it to hedgehogs trying to cross a busy thousands-of-lanes motorway. Some might get across one, a very few across even four lanes. But to believe that one could traverse the whole mass of traffic lanes without being squashed ...!

The onus lies with evolutionists to prove 'intelligent design' wrong. *"The simplicity that was once expected to be the foundation of life has proven to be a phantom; instead, systems of horrendous, irreducible complexity inhabit the cell."* Far from evolutionists producing an answer, Behe's examination of their answers including those in their Journal of Molecular Evolution, demonstrates they have none. He shows what they actually do is to airlift the hedgehogs across the thousands of lanes to the last few, then posit their successful crossing. In other words they 'cook' their experiments. He then itemises numerically all the few references to evolution in university level microbiological textbooks. None attempt any form of answer to the problems of irreducible complexity. These stare scientists in the face, yet the only response of evolutionists is a total silence. His challenge to them is to 'put up or shut up;' to 'Publish or Perish;' but he puts it in a winsome way.

.....

## CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Rev. Malcolm,

A little while ago I was sent a copy of the June edition of the Church of England Continuing publication - 'The Journal'. You ask for comments regarding the publication - it could be a bit fuller. I feel that if you are to put over the message of the C of E C, both to the unsaved masses, and the mass of varied other christian denominations, then it would help to see more of what the C of E C believes is - the faith.

As an example you yourself state at the end of your article 'My Reasons', that you fully believe the 39 Articles of Religion. Could you yourself tell me why, you personally feel they are all true. As an evangelical convert to the A C C position I would be particularly interested to read what you have to say.\*

I am also writing to you, because of something I read recently in Holy Scripture, this verse - Nehemiah chapter 4 verse 19: "*The work is great and extensive, and we are separated far from one another on the wall*". All of us whether we have joined either the C of E C; the T C E; the T A C; or the A C C; we have left behind our Babylon, ie the 'established' C of E, and struck out for our Anglican 'Jerusalem'. All of us, no matter what group, under our respective Bishops, are busily engaged in building something. I believe that as long as what we are building is the Kingdom of God, then all is OK, because if we are not then all that is left to build is yet another denomination simply repeating, the problems we have left behind.

To this end I am asking our Mission Prayer co-ordinator, to include all Anglican groups that are outside the Church of England; in our Sunday service intercessions and weekly prayer meetings.

I would like to continue to receive regular copies of The Journal. I would be glad for any feed back regarding what I have said in this letter,

Yours sincerely in Jesus Christ, our Lord & Saviour,

Philip Barrett. Dip. TH. Lay reader in Charge, of the Mission Parish of St. Budoc, Plymouth. The Anglican Catholic Church.

**Please address replies: The Editor, 15 Bridge Street, Knighton, Powys LD7 1BT  
Tel. & Fax 01547 528815.**

*[\*Our Lord, when asked about difficulties in the Old Testament, such as on divorce in Mark 10 and Matthew 19, did not reply, 'Yes, I agree with you, the book is too hard to understand' Rather He said in effect, 'You need to forget the traditions and*

*theories by which you approach it. Then you will understand it.' The 39 Articles only claim to be a true reflection of Scripture. Thus Anglo-Catholics and Liberals need in approaching the Articles, the one to shed their traditions to which they have to square the Word, and the other their pre-conceived theories by which they make it artificially difficult. Then the Articles of Religion and the Scripture the 39 reflect, will be as plain to them as to the editor].*

---

## THE CONTINUING CHURCH

### Leadership in UK and USA

The Right Reverend David N. Samuel, M.A., Ph.D., (*Presiding Bishop*)

The Right Reverend Albion W. Knight Jr. M.A., M.S., (*Bishop, United States of America*)

### Central Committee

The Rt. Rev. D. N. Samuel, MA., Ph.D., (*Chairman*)

The Rt. Rev. E. Malcolm, B.A. (*Assistant Bishop*)

The Rev. B.G. Felce, M. A.

The Rev. J.F. Shearer, B.Sc.

Mr. D. K. Mansell, (*Treasurer*)

Dr. N. Malcolm. M.A., M.B., F.R.C.P. (*Secretary*)

### Churches

**St. Mary's, Castle Street, Reading.** Sunday Services: 11.00 a.m. Morning Prayer (1<sup>st</sup> Sunday Lord's Supper); 6.30 p.m. Evening Prayer (3<sup>rd</sup> Sunday Lord's Supper). Tuesday 8.00 pm Bible Study & Prayer Meeting (2<sup>nd</sup> Tuesday Missionary Prayer Meeting) Enquiries 0118 959 5131.

**Former Congregation of St. John the Baptist with St. Mary-le-Port,** Chapel of the Three Kings, Foster's Almshouses, top of Christmas Steps, Colston Street, Bristol 1. Sunday Service: 11.00 a.m. Morning prayer. Enquiries 01934 712520.

**Nuffield Congregation** meeting with Nuffield Parish Church, near Henley-on-Thames, the Rev. John F. Shearer. Sunday Services: 11.00 a.m. Morning Prayer, 6.30 p.m. Evening Prayer. Lord's Supper 8.00 a.m. 1<sup>st</sup> Sunday, 6.30 p.m. 3<sup>rd</sup> Sunday. Bible Study Wednesday 8.00 p.m. Enquiries 01491 641305.

**St. John's Church, South London** - Meeting at Raynes Park Assembly Hall (*Kingston Road & Clifton Park Avenue, Raynes Park SW20*) on 1<sup>st</sup> & 4<sup>th</sup> Lord's Days of the month; and at the Shaftesbury Home - Trellis House (*Mill Road (off Merton High Street), Colliers Wood, SW 19*) on 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> Lord's Days of the month, for 11.00 a.m. Morning Prayer and 6.30 p.m. Evening Prayer. Enquiries 0181 642 7885 or 0181 682 3290.

**St. Silas Church, Wolverhampton**, in Bethany Chapel, Lower Prestwood Road (junction Blackwood Avenue), Wednesfield. Sundays 12.40 p.m. Morning Prayer (followed by Holy Communion 1<sup>st</sup> Sunday); 4.00 p.m. Evening Prayer (Holy Communion 3<sup>rd</sup> Sunday). Tuesdays (term time only): 4.15 p.m. Tuesday Class; 7.30 p.m. Bible Study with 8.15 p.m. Prayer Time. Enquiries 01547 528 815.

### **Clergy**

The Rev. E. J. Malcolm, The Parsonage, 1, Downshire Square, Reading RG1 6NJ. 0118 959 5131, who edits the Prayer Bulletin.

### **Associate Clergy**

The Rev. J. N. Reed B.A., B. D. (United States of America)

### **Treasurer**

Mr. D. K. Mansell, 17, Greenfels Rise, Oakham, Dudley, West Midlands DY2 7TP. Tel. 01384 259 781. **Have you considered covenanting your gift to the Association of the Continuing Church Trust?** If you pay income tax, you can increase the value of your gift at no further cost to yourself. Forms gladly supplied on request to the Treasure. Nearly all your gifts go to clergy training, for which the **Allan Bowhill Memorial Fund** exists. *Gifts intended for local churches should be earmarked.*

### **Secretary**

Dr. N. Malcolm, M.A., M.B., F.R.C.P. Kingswood House, Pilcorn Street, Wedmore, Somerset BS28 4AW. Tel. 01934 712 520.

### **Editor of Journal**

The Rt. Rev. E. Malcolm, 15, Bridge Street, Knighton, Powys LD7 1BT. Tel. & Fax 01547 528 815.

**MATERIAL FOR JANUARY ISSUE BY 20th DECEMBER, PLEASE.**

Please send the names and addresses of anyone to whom you would like the Journal sent. It is free, but donations are welcomed. Would you also please say if the Journal is no longer required.

## CONSTITUTION

- 1 **Doctrine:** The doctrine of the Continuing Church shall be that of the 39 Articles of Religion understood in their original, natural and intended sense.
- 2 **Worship:** The worship of the Continuing Church shall be generally according to the Book of Common Prayer (1662).

The Authorised Version of the Bible shall be the only version used in the lectern and the pulpit and in public readings and expositions at all meetings of the Continuing Church.

- 3 **Ministry:** The consecration and ordination of ministers shall be according to the Ordinal of the Book of Common Prayer (1662). The Continuing Church believes in the ministry of women according to Scripture which does not permit them to teach or exercise authority, particularly as bishops, priests, and deacons.
- 4 **Discipline:** The church shall be episcopally governed. A general assembly shall be held not less than once a year consisting of the bishop and the ministers of the church and representatives of the local congregations to transact the business of the denomination and for mutual encouragement and edification.
- 5 **Membership:** New churches may apply for membership of the Continuing Church on the basis of their agreement with the doctrine, worship and discipline of that body.

Membership of the local church shall be on the basis of baptism and confirmation and approval by the local presbyter.

Any matters incapable of resolution shall be referred to the Ordinary.