

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

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



Issue No: 10
January 1999

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,

The decadence of our society is now writ large on the nation's life, so that he who runs may read. The parallels between the decline and fall of the Roman Empire and the state of Western Civilization in the late twentieth century have been remarked on before, but perhaps some brief review of them may serve to heighten our awareness of the danger in which we now stand. First, there was the breakup of the Roman Empire, followed by the issue of doles and benefits to the urban masses and their growing preoccupation with conflict and violence. Then came the breakup of the aristocracy under middle class expansion, and later the destruction of the middle classes in the interests of the lower classes. Then there was escalating inflation and ever heavier taxes to support the army and social services. Decline in public safety went hand in hand with decline in standards, behaviour and dress, in imitation of the lower classes. Further concessions were made to the lower classes and all were declared equal. Superstition, belief in astrology, and other occult systems grew apace. Artistic and technical greatness declined, and corruption and intrigue reached unprecedented levels.

Of course, no exact parallels can be drawn between past and present, nor can the course of future events be read off automatically from such a convergence of signs. But there is sufficient evidence here to cause us deep concern. Under God, there were those in the Christian Church who rose to the challenge these circumstances presented. Augustine's great work *The City of God* directed people's minds and hearts to the eternal order, and the salvation of God in Jesus Christ. Must we not seek also to respond to the challenge of our age by setting forth the Christian hope and the answer of God in history to man's deepest need of redemption and new life? Liberalism in the church at large has emasculated this message just at the time when Christians should be responding to the desperate need of the age. Six million pounds of the church's money is spent on the maintenance of the General Synod alone, to produce such footling motions as to change the tenth commandment to read, "You shall not covet your neighbours donkey", instead of "Thou shalt not covet thy

neighbours ass”. Is this not fiddling whilst Rome burns? The world and our society is in need of the unchanging message of God’s redeeming love in Jesus Christ. Let us seek by God’s grace to make it known.

A correspondent to this Journal said recently that we did not make our position clear. I am rather surprised at that since it is fully set out in our constitution. We hold to the classical Anglican position. Our teaching is that of the Thirty-Nine Articles, our liturgy that of the Book of Common Prayer. We take these things seriously, and firmly believe all the articles of the great creeds, and view Scripture as the infallible and unerring Word of God. Let those who wish to join in the great task of our age join us in this, so that the trumpet for our generation has no uncertain sound. And let us remember that the time is short. Our Lord said of himself, “The things concerning me have an end,” that is the prophecies about him would soon be fulfilled. Likewise, he said of the nation of Israel, in the parable of the barren fig tree: “Let it alone this year also, and I will dig it about and dung it; and if it bear fruit well, and if not, then after that thou shalt cut it down.” Three short years decided the fate of the Jewish people; I believe we are living in critical days and we have no time to lose.

The arrow is flown,
The moment is gone;
The millennial year
Rushes on to the view, and eternity’s here.

(Charles Wesley)

Yours sincerely in Christ,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Samuel". The script is cursive and fluid, with a large initial 'D' and 'S'.

David Samuel

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE C of E (C)

SATURDAY 3 JULY 1999

*Nibley House, North Nibley, Gloucestershire
10.30 a.m. for 11 o'clock start*

The day includes:

Keynote address by the Presiding Bishop, David N. Samuel Ph.D. in the morning. Following Lunch, for which we bring our own picnics and drinks, and during which there is opportunity to walk to the Tyndale Memorial,

A Question and Answer Session with opportunity to discuss the affairs of the C of E (C). This will include a financial report.

*The day ends with tea at 3.30 p.m., after which we disperse.
There is a collection to cover expenses.*

Programme with travel directions obtainable from the Secretary, Dr. N. Malcolm, Tel. 01934 712520, or SAE to Kingswood House, Pilcorn Street, Wedmore, Som. BS28 4AW

THE POWER OF TRUTH

David Samuel

Last year Dr. J. I. Packer gave the Latimer Lecture at Oxford. Dr. Packer is an Anglican now living in Canada, where he is Professor of Theology at Regent College, Vancouver. He has a wide knowledge of Anglicanism. The title of his lecture was 'Unity in Truth: the Anglican Agony'. The burden of his address was that the Church of England and the Anglican Communion were in crisis. Communal structures have been shaken loose; the 'centre cannot hold', Anglicanism will fly apart. World Anglicanism is an accident, its growth and development could not have been predicted. However, there is nothing inevitable about its growth or even its survival.

World Anglicanism has become ambiguous. It was defined by its links with bishops and the use of the Book of Common Prayer. Each new province affirmed its solidarity with other parts. Now it has drifted from its foundation, from the Book of Common Prayer and the 39 Articles of Religion. Anglicanism has been politicised. Power blocks have been formed which are determined to get their own way. The result has been a landslide into liberalism. With liberalism in control the church is under pressure to adapt to the world. This has meant relativism in theology, syncretism in religion, naturalism in liturgy, unisex in ministry, and a socio-political concept of mission. Provinces are split and out of line with their Anglican heritage; small wonder they are declining. Anglican comprehensiveness has exploded.

What can be done, Dr. Packer asked, from this position to strengthen unity? Unity cannot be recovered without truth. He suggested that a moratorium be set on hasty change; that there be an appeal for debate and tolerance; and that theological development take place from fundamentals. Of course, Dr. Packer acknowledged that none of this might happen, and if that is the case we shall simply have to ‘go gaily in the dark’, to borrow a phrase from G.K. Chesterton. While I differ from Dr. Packer on a number of issues, especially his involvement with ‘Protestants and Catholics Together’, he is right in his assessment of the state of Anglicanism; it is now in crisis. There is nothing doctrinally to hold it together. All the basic verities have been given up, revelation has been abandoned.

No Revelation

During the women’s ordination debate in General Synod in 1993 the Bishop of Sheffield warned of the danger of the church taking an a-revelational position, that is, acting as if there were no revelation in Scripture. That however, is what the Church of England has done and is doing. But the Bishop of Sheffield was not the first to discern this danger. There were those who sensed it coming many years ago. It was a necessary consequence of the theological liberalism then being adopted. The acceptance of these teachings meant that the Bible and positive doctrinal teaching were being downgraded. But there was another factor also working with this. Some kind of external unity and comprehension were being sought, the reunion of Christendom, of all persuasions and traditions. Doctrine stood in the way of this, so doctrine was downgraded. This is what B. B. Warfield said about it at the time:

‘The assault upon positive doctrinal teaching is presented today chiefly under the flag of ‘comprehension’. Men bewail divisions of the church of Christ and propose that we shall stop thinking, so that we may no longer think differently. This is the true account to give of many of the phases of the modern movement of church union. Men are tired of thinking. They are tired of defending the truth. Let us all stop thinking, stop believing, they cry, and what a happy family we shall be’

(The Theology of the Reformation p 588).

It is dangerous, indeed disastrous to play down doctrine, because doctrine is fundamental to the church’s very existence. The loss of doctrine, of truth, is not something the church can survive, as a man can survive the loss of a limb and yet get along quite well after a fashion. The loss of truth means annihilation. The relationship between the Word of truth and the church is shown to us very clearly in Scripture.

The Church and Truth

The church, the apostle Paul says in Ephesians 2: 20, is ‘built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief

corner stone.’ What Paul is saying is that the church rests upon the teaching of the apostles and prophets concerning Jesus Christ. The truth concerning him is the foundation stone. Remove that and the building collapses. Again, in 1 Timothy 3: 15 Paul speaks of the church as ‘the pillar and ground of the truth’. What the apostle means is that the church holds forth and publishes the truth concerning Christ just as a post or pillar to which a proclamation is affixed holds forth the proclamation. But what is the pillar without the proclamation? What is a signpost without a sign? Its very existence is negated by that fact. Yet again, in the Book of Revelation we are told that the churches are like candlesticks or lampholders. But a lampholder is merely a contrivance for holding up a lamp. The lampholder can itself give no light. If the lamp of the Gospel goes out the lampholder is useless. Which is why Christ warns the church at Ephesus to ‘repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place’ (Revelation 2: 5). He will take it away since it no longer serves any useful purpose. As Bishop Ryle put it:

‘It is not orders, or endowments, or liturgies that will keep a church alive. Let free forgiveness through Christ be faithfully proclaimed in her pulpits, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her. Let it be kept back, and her candlestick will soon be taken away’.

So we see that the Bible repeatedly asserts that local, institutional churches, (not of course the true, universal church of God’s elect), cannot lose the truth without being in the greatest peril of ceasing to exist. Where are those churches in Asia Minor to which the apostle John wrote? They are no more. And there is no guarantee that the church here in England will go on without the truth. Its whole existence is bound up with the Gospel, with revealed truth.

Recovery of Truth

Therefore the great issue before the church today is the recovery of truth, of doctrinal integrity, of eternal verities. Without truth everything is lost. But I see no sign of its recovery within the established church, and I will tell you why. Since the measure for the ordination of women there has been a lot of talk about ‘two integrities’. The bishops were afraid that there might be a mass exodus of priests following the passing of the measure and so they felt something had to be done to prevent that. A Code of Conduct was devised which in no way changed or qualified the measure and the rigour of the canon attaching to it, but allowed priests in practice to ignore it. So while they took an oath of canonical obedience which included statements that the ordination of women is not repugnant to Scripture and that women are lawfully ordained priests and ought to be so accounted both by themselves and others, yet in practice they could disregard it.

What then does the expression ‘two integrities’ mean? It means no integrity at all. But in a sense this is not new, the ground for it has been prepared over a long period of time. When Parliament rejected the 1928 Deposited Prayer Book, the bishops made it known that the clergy might use it, though it had no lawful authority, and so ministers who had solemnly sworn to ‘use the form in the said book prescribed, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority’, were permitted to use the deposited book. For decades Anglo-Catholics practised ‘mental reservation’, that is they subscribed to the Thirty-Nine Articles publicly, then said they did not really believe them. With the connivance of the bishops they said one thing and did another. Dishonesty was institutionalised and turned into a way of life. We see the same thing operating today with regard to the question of homosexuality. The official position of the Church of England is that practicing homosexuals cannot be ordained. Yet it is common knowledge that certain bishops ignore this ruling and proceed to ordain such persons regardless of it. So you see why I say there is little prospect of the recovery of truth in the national church. Evasion, equivocation, dissembling, have seeped into the texture of its life to such an extent that it is virtually impossible to eradicate it.

Steps to be Taken

But to come back to my point, the recovery of truth is of fundamental importance, and if it cannot be done within the established church, it must be done outside it.

First, it is essential that ministers should be those who have experienced the power of the truth, that they should have felt the force of the doctrines they preach. Thomas Scott, the celebrated Bible commentator, wrote a book entitled, ‘The Force of Truth’. He was at one time a Unitarian in his theology, though a clergyman of the established church. He had subscribed the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion but did not believe them. But he came under conviction of sin, and being near Olney where John Newton was the curate conversed with him. He came to experience the doctrines of grace and the truth was written in his heart by the Spirit of God. He gave an account of this in ‘The Force of Truth’.

Ezekiel speaks of the prophet as a watchman whose duty it is to awaken others. But the watchman must first be awake himself. A man cannot effectively preach repentance, the new birth and justification by faith unless he knows of these things at first hand.

Secondly, we must hold definite doctrinal views. This may be regarded by some as too rigid or legalistic. But how else can the Gospel of truth be preserved? In Scripture the Gospel is identified with certain doctrines. Paul wrote to Galatia and Corinth exhorting the churches there that they were to hold to the teaching he had given them and no other. ‘Though we or an

angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed' (Galatians 1: 8). And again, 'I declare unto you the Gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you'. (1 Corinthians 15: 1 & 2).

There must therefore be an identity and continuity between the doctrines of Scripture and those of the church today. That is the true apostolic succession. Without the determination to maintain this identity and succession there can be no recovery of truth. There must be firm resolve to be 'on messag' as the current expression has it. Bishop Ryle said,

'Never be afraid to hold doctrinal opinions. If you believe little, then those whom you try to help will believe nothing.'

Thirdly, there must be seriousness in religion. We are exhorted many times in Scripture to be 'sober'. It means getting things in proper proportion, discerning the things that matter and giving them their due weight and importance. There must also be a sense of awe and reverence. Much of this is missing today from the church. Everything is mixed up. The grave and the trivial, the sublime and the ridiculous are juxtaposed in worship. Men's minds are confused and unfitted to treat of solemn things. Much contemporary religion is entertainment, and not very good entertainment either. It makes for unstable, immature Christians.

Fourthly, there must be a resolve to contend for the truth.

'Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.' If truth be properly understood and valued, there will be a willingness to contend for it. A man will contend for his good name. He will go to law for it. He will not rest, the truth must be vindicated, he says. At least the same zeal should be shown by Christians for the Gospel.

And, finally, there should be a willingness to suffer for the truth.

There is a price to be paid for faithfulness. This has been true in every age of the church; it cannot be different today. What does faithfulness to the truth mean for you? Are you testifying to it by the way you live, where you worship? It is said that the Reformation took hold of the common people in England because they saw the Reformers testify to it with their lives. Such is the power of truth.

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

David Samuel

NEWS OF THE CHURCHES

Former Congregation of St. John the Baptist with St. Mary-Le-Port, Bristol. **Dr. Napier Malcolm** continues to make a steady recovery, and wishes to thank all those who have prayed for him and for Ruth, his wife. Also to express gratitude to Bishop Samuel, and the others who have maintained the services. We assure Mrs. Kimpton of our sympathy in the loss of her husband **Mr. John Kimpton**. His death is a loss to the C of E (C). He served the church well and also for many years did the recording of conferences for both the PRS and Church Society, as well as serving for many years as a lay reader. When Bishop Samuel visited him in hospital and had Bible reading and prayer with him, he took out the Journal from the locker and said that we must support the C of E (C). He prayed for us. How much we owe to the prayers of saints of God!

St. John's, South Wimbledon. A Ladies' Meeting starts on 3rd February DV.

Mr. Andrew Price writes: 'my immediate family background was non Christian and totally indifferent to the things of God. However in the goodness and mercy of God there was a Bible in the house and I had godly relatives - two great aunts and my grandmother. They prayed for me and their prayers were answered. I started to read the Bible and I called on the name of the Lord as a needy sinner. Although I was from an unchurched family, as a Christian I quickly recognised the need to be baptized. Notwithstanding my principle experience of evangelical religion was a small mission hall near to where I lived, and Scottish Presbyterianism on my mother's side, I was convinced my spiritual home was in the Church of England. I loved the Prayer Book and the 39 Articles and the principle of a national Established Church. In my late 'teens I was both baptized and confirmed.

Even as a young Christian I became exercised about serving God in the ministry. This feeling increased whilst I was at University. However I always believed I should wait until I was older and things were clearer. In God's providence this meant that I had a profitable time working for the Trinitarian Bible Society. I became convinced I should delay no longer when God blessed to me Romans Chapter 10 and in particular: 'The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart: that is the word of faith which we preach'. May God in His great mercy use me as an instrument for good to point needy sinners to His dear Son - the Lord Jesus Christ.'

Mr. Price has a tract on 'Mormonism', which he is willing to supply on request.

St. Mary's Castle Street, Reading.

In December we celebrated our Bicentenary, with a series of Exhibitions, services, and other events. Although we did not have as many visitors to the church as we should have liked, we were very thankful that most who came enjoyed their visits. We were able to give away a certain amount of evangelistic literature, including Bibles to some forty-five school children who came to the Bible Exhibition. It illustrated one thing, that an open church is most welcome. As a result we shall be looking to open the building for a few hours each Saturday.

We were privileged in having Bishop Edward Malcolm to preach on the Anniversary Sunday, 13th December, and were grateful for the support of a number of folk from the Continuing congregations. And on Wednesday 16th, the actual Bicentenary Day, Bishop Samuel came and led a service. It is intended that we publish both sermons in due course.

The Mayor of Reading told the folk who remained for lunch after the Sunday service that the local Council has plans to demolish the shopping centre behind the church to make way for a new development, which will include residential properties. We see this as an exciting opportunity for the future, and would ask you earnestly to join us in prayer for the future, for our witness, and for the work of the gospel in Reading.

In December the Ladies Meeting was relaunched. The first subject was 'Elisabeth', and the next, on January 29th, will be 'Ruth.' Another meeting is planned for February, DV.

Nuffield Congregation

Christmas Services: *The Church was about full for the Carols by Candlelight service and we pray that the strong gospel message will lead to Holy Spirit conviction - or folk won't be back again next year! On Christmas Day the Church seemed to be even more crowded and it was lovely to have Sue Lister (a former helper in the Prison ministry) on the organ and her parents in the congregation.*

Monthly Missionary Meetings: ***November 27th*** *Visit of Martha Morphew. This was a most enlightening evening in which we learnt of the desperate plight of thousands of children in Sri Lanka and the positive efforts that are being made to 'adopt' them into extended Christian families. Martha is there now!*

January 22nd 7.30 pm: *Visit of Rev. Michael Harley to speak to us about the work of the Trinitarian Bible Society, and to bring a selection of their*

publications. We conclude at 9.00 pm with refreshments, and expect friends from other Churches to join us.

February 26th 7.30 pm: Visit of Pavlos Karageorgi, who will speak and show slides of Greek culture, religion, and how the gospel is being brought to Greeks in this country.

March 26th 7.30 pm: Meeting to focus our attention on the work of the Pilgrim Homes (Retired missionaries, etc) when we expect Philip Grist to address us.

Visitors are always welcome at the meetings, and Bed and Breakfast is offered to those travelling any distance.

HEAD - KEPHALE - AUTHORITY OVER

Ephesians 5:23 *the husband is the **head** of the wife, even as Christ is the **head** of the church:*

1 Corinthians 11:3 *the **head** of every man is Christ; and the **head** of the woman is the man; and the **head** of Christ is God.*

The word *kephale*, 'head' in the New Testament has always been understood to mean 'authority over', but today many deny this, saying that 'head' in these contexts means 'source' or 'origin.' In 'The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood: a Further Report' (General Synod Document 198), F.F. Bruce is quoted on 1 Corinthians:

'By head in this context we are probably to understand not, as has frequently been suggested, 'chief' or 'ruler' but rather 'source' or 'origin'. Thus it is argued that Christ is the source of every man, Christ is the source of the church - and, referring to Adam and Eve - the man is the source of the woman.

In the case of Ephesians 5:23 that is a very unlikely meaning, as the verse begins with 'For', thus building a case on what has been said in verse 22, 'Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife...' The headship of the husband is given as the reason for the submission of the wife, and so '*kephale*' naturally signifies some form of leadership. Paul then goes on to add a further reason in verse 23, 'even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body'. The picture is that a body with a head. That in turn leads on to the 'one flesh' unity in verses 28 - 30 'So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies ... even as the Lord the church; For we are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones'. Now if 'head' is 'source', what is the

husband the source of? Obviously, that which the head provides the body. It is the source of food through the mouth, guidance through the eyes and brain and alert reaction. Thus the husband is to provide leadership, provision and protection. Thus if the word ‘source’ is taken as the most natural meaning, men are called of God to be like Christ as servant-leaders, protectors and providers. In their turn, wives are to honour their husbands’ leadership.

In the case of 1 Corinthians 11: 3, we must refer to all the 12 usages of the word *kephale* in the New Testament. It is indisputable that the meaning is ‘authority’ in a number of these passages, such as Colossians 2:15, whilst the meaning ‘source’ is never certainly attested. Here, wives do not derive their life from their husbands. How then are husbands the ‘source’ of their wives? There is no evidence that Paul is here speaking of Adam being the source of Eve, as some have maintained. Nor is Paul to be accused, as some egalitarians dare, of ‘subordinationism’, that is a denial of the perfect equality that exists in the Trinity. Paul is teaching that the difference of role in the Trinity between Father and Son is dimly reflected in the same perfect equality, yet difference of role, in the husband-wife relationship.

Argument and Counterargument

The accusation is then levelled that our interpretation of Scripture is more influenced by our background and culture than by what the authors of Scripture actually intended. That has to be acknowledged as a possibility - for **both** sides in this discussion. Further it is argued that the passages about the submission of women are found in what are called ‘the household codes’ in the New Testament, which in turn came from first-century culture. For us that would mean we must not offend against contemporary culture today, and so must be willing to change our practices on the relationship of men and women, rather than hold fast to first-century cultural behaviour. It is then argued that the Lord Jesus liberated women by his treatment, opening the way for women to be given access to ministerial roles. On top of that it is argued that the statement Paul makes in Galatians 3: 28 ‘There is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus’, removes gender as a basis for distinct roles in the church. The arguments go on and on.

Its Importance

Most of these matters would be settled if the meaning of *kephale* ‘head’ could be agreed. The best would be a first-century New Testament Greek dictionary definition. Sadly, the ancients had no dictionaries, so we have to reconstruct the meaning. After arguing to and fro about the meaning of the word in the New Testament, certain scholars have decided the meaning through ancient Greek literature, where in some instances it is said that *kephale* means ‘source’. Also they reason that the meaning ‘authority over’ was uncommon or unknown in Greek, so Paul’s readers could not have

understood *kephale* that way. If this is so, here is a conclusive argument one way or the other. So we must ask, are they right?

This is even more imperative as many times reading their books you will meet a learned footnote quoting one of these scholars as the final word on the subject. Even in talks in favour of women's ordination this dazzling light was shone in the eyes of any who would say that *kephale* means 'head'. It was foundational to the Scriptural case for the priesthood of women, and was given pride of place amongst Scriptural arguments in the General Synod Document quoted above (General Synod put Scripture under the title 'Other Considerations' as seventh of its nine chapters!). We agree it is foundational.

A Weak Case

Many articles by scholars depend, once one gets to their footnote references, on a few scholars they quote or rest on as their authority. A Pentecostalist scholar called Dr. Wayne Grudem has taken the trouble to go through 2,336 examples of the use of *kephale* in a wide range of ancient Greek literature, and concludes that there are no convincing examples where *kephale* meant 'source'. He has considered the positions of all scholars of note who argue from Greek literature that *kephale* means 'source', or 'pre-eminence' in these texts, as opposed to 'authority over'. His conclusions are that the arguments used to claim *kephale* could mean 'source' are surprisingly weak and unimpressive. Indeed, he claims that all the articles and commentaries depend upon only two examples of *kephale* in ancient literature, Heroditus and 'Orphic Fragments', both of which date from more than four hundred years before Christ, both of which are unconvincing. Heroditus simply shows *kephale* can refer to the end points of a river. In this case (4.91) the source, but elsewhere, the mouth. To be convincing, it has to be shown that 'end point' here requires the meaning of 'source'. He concludes the evidence is unconvincing. In the case of 'Orphic Fragments' 21.a, the author calls Zeus the 'head' of all things, but in a context where it is impossible to tell whether it means 'first one, beginning' (an attested use of *kephale*), or 'source', (a meaning not otherwise attested).

Grudem then quotes the evidence in favour of *kephale* meaning 'authority over', which he calls 'substantial'. All the major lexicons specialising in the New Testament period give this meaning, whereas none give the meaning 'source'. In the case of the Liddell-Scott lexicon, the meaning 'authority over' is missed out by an oversight needing correction, but it must be noted that this lexicon does not specialise in the New Testament period. Of the 2,336 examples, 49 used *kephale* as meaning 'person of superior authority or rank', or 'ruler, ruling part'. Those meanings are therefore the acceptable and understandable sense for *kephale* in the times of the New Testament. His final argument is that 'authority over' best

suits many New Testament contexts.

What makes Grudem even more convincing, is that since he published that reply in 1985, he has been replied to by Richard Cervin putting forward a new meaning for *kephale* as ‘preeminence’, rejecting both ‘source’ and ‘authority over’. Grudem’s reply is that Cervin rejects all New Testament examples of *kephale* as ‘disputed texts’ without examining them, but concludes his article by telling us what Paul did or did not mean by them. This is not legitimate linguistic analysis. Cervin also rejects all Septuagint (Jewish translation of the Old Testament into Greek two centuries before Christ) examples. This was widely used by New Testament writers and Greek speaking Christians throughout the ancient world, and always supports ‘authority over’. He also disallows all quotations from the ‘Apostolic Fathers’, yet the original significance of the title was to describe those who knew the apostles personally. He rejects such very early documents as the ‘Shepherd of Hermas’, the Patristic evidence, only one stage removed from the ‘Apostolic Fathers’, and indeed any early source that militates against his case. For instance he dismisses the New Testament Lexicons without examining them and questions the competence of their authors on the grounds they did not ponder Plato, Heroditus or Plutarch. Grudem answers that Cervin seems unfamiliar with the best of all lexicons, the Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker lexicon which has minutely researched thousands of examples from non-biblical authors, whilst carefully recognising the need to isolate New Testament language from contemporary speech. At the same time, Cervin gives extensive weight to lexicons specialising in authors far from the New Testament of which only two date from anywhere near the New Testament period. Grudem goes through Cervin’s sources minutely, and answers every argument put forward in a most convincing fashion. A more exhaustive study of the word *kephale* is unlikely to appear. It means ‘authority over’.

STUMBLINGBLOCKS

Reading through the apostle Paul’s Epistles over the years, it has never failed to amaze me how sensitive he was to any criticism of his behaviour. So much so that he was prepared to discuss openly with the churches his own personal appearance, habits, his preaching ability, his scholarship, his calling as an apostle, his private plans and itineraries, even his own most intimate money matters and right to marry. These are things most of us are entirely unwilling to hold up to public gaze. Why then was he so keen on this unseemly justifying of himself?

One might conclude that he was oversensitive to criticism. That he was sensitive is undeniable. He felt criticisms deeply and was hurt by such requital of his love. Yet he states that others' judgments of him do not concern him, having left all that with the Lord who will judge everything. Hurt pride therefore was not the reason for his blatant self-justification. Other reasons have been alleged, such as that he was an exhibitionist, an extrovert and a despiser of womankind, who did not care if he created factions and split churches, as long as he won a following. None of these alleged reasons stand when examined in the light of the epistles. There is a different reason.

The reason Paul gave was his love of his Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ, and God's precious Gospel entrusted to him, Paul. This alone had the power to save mankind, and any criticism of Paul's behaviour ultimately reflected upon the Gospel he preached and would result in the world's only hope, Christ Jesus, being besmirched.

Much of this criticism had its source in certain men who wished to overthrow Paul's apostleship and with it all he stood for, and to get the churches to follow their line. Thus, at the Reformation the Roman Church, unable to answer Martin Luther's arguments, attacked his character as a dissolute monk whose lusts burned too strongly for him to keep his vows of celibacy and chastity, so he deserted the cloister to marry. I was told only the other week by a well taught Roman Catholic that 'Luther was a bad man', directly the subject of justification by faith came up. These charges have stopped countless Roman Catholics heeding the Gospel. It would not be difficult to enumerate such attacks upon both Reformers and Protestants ever since.

One: Desertion

A favourite way of dismissing the Church of England (Continuing) is to say that certain of its pastors deserted and divided their flocks by leaving the Church of England. This is a serious charge, repeatedly laid publicly, which if true is reprehensible. Painful as it is, the whole subject needs re-examining. Hampered as we were by loyalty, we offered as plainly as possible in the circumstances, every opportunity to those many who agreed with us, to stay with us their pastors, but not with their families, friends, socially accepted positions and buildings. Did we not give full warning, including from the pulpit and in writing, years in advance? Were not public meetings and discussions held, and did not some of those who now say we were wrong, say that they were coming with us, then changed their minds and stayed? Dr. Packer acknowledges that liberalism with its attendant evils has taken the driving seat in the Church of England. That was our contention all along. Are the evangelical colleges not accepting women for training as

presbyters? The downslide following the desertion of absolute truth and the plain meaning of the Bible has continued. We would willingly return should the Church of England revert to the Bible as its sole source of doctrine and practice. Yet there is no sign of this happening. Just look at women's ministry and the toleration of homosexual clergy.

Two: Money

A Christian man from a local Free Church and I were talking together some months ago, when he suddenly shot a glance at me and said accusingly, 'You get your money from the Church of England'. To take just one other example out of many, a senior evangelical cleric with whom I was conversing recently raised the same matter, in a more delicate way. When talking to such one realises they are speaking for many others who believe that we are on to a good thing: costless 'faithfulness'. We adopt the moral high ground, whilst the Established Church foots the bill.

If this charge is true, then it debases our stance, if not making us downright hypocrites. What then did happen? The General Synod changed the Church of England doctrinally for the first time since the Reformation. We changed not a whit. The Parliamentary Committee set up to examine the matter of women's ordination to the presbyterate, laid it down that as the conditions of employment of clergy had been altered, the Church of England must make provision for those ministers of hers who were conscientiously unable to go along with the changes. This was partly to avoid the Church of England forcing us onto social security. She had to take responsibility for the results of her own actions, not leave the taxpayer to pick up the tab.

The settlement was a fair one and we are thankful for it, and would not have raised it again, except that it seems to have become a stumbling-block. The other reason Parliament laid down the financial settlement of the previous year's rate of stipend for 12 months, then three quarters of that for 12 months, then two-thirds of that for 12 months, ending with one month for each year served, was that there might be a period for clergy to re-train and take up another profession. God called us, so we have never felt for a moment that we could desert our sacred calling and move to some secular job, however financially attractive. Incidentally, we never accepted housing help from the Church Commissioners.

Did God set his seal upon what we did? I had only a few pounds in the bank when I made my announcement that I could not conscientiously subscribe to the changed canon law, whereby women were placed in charge of men in churches, and the word 'he' made to mean 'she'. That very week God unexpectedly sent us five thousand pounds in a legacy. Let my detractors

argue with the God who loves truth. I dwell in the secret of his pavilion, safe from the strife of tongues. Only the necessity of clearing my Master's impugned conduct wrings this out of me.

Edward Malcolm

Edward Malcolm.

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Editor,

The eirenic spirit in which Philip Barrett of the ACC wrote his letter to you and in which you published it is a hopeful sign in what is an otherwise depressing 'continuing Anglican' scene in the UK.

With numbers of 'continuers' being so few, but their essential stance being so similar, it is tragic that they are divided into so many 'penny' (and even 'half-penny') packets from the long established Free Church of England to the Anglican Catholic Church (now divided into two factions), via the Church of England (Continuing), the Traditional Anglican Communion and the Traditional Church of England.

It would be good to think that Philip's letter and your gracious publication of it could at least lead to a meeting of representatives of the various groups to discuss prayerfully their points of agreement/disagreement and ways of possible co-operation.

Yours in the Lord's Service,

Alan Edwards.

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

THE CONTINUING CHURCH

(The Association of the Continuing Church Trust: Charity No. 1055010)

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 (first Sunday Lord's Supper); 6.30 p.m. Evening Prayer (third Sunday Lord's Supper). Enquiries 01889 595 131.

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 01491 641 305.

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. first Sunday, 6.30 p.m. third Sunday. Bible Study Wednesday 8.00 p.m. Enquiries 10491 641 305.

St. John's Church, South London - Meeting at Raynes Park Assembly Hall (Kingston Road & Clifton Park Avenue, Raynes Park SW20) on 1st & 4th Lord's Days of the month; and at the Shaftesbury Home - Trellis House (Mill Road (off Merton High Street), Colliers Wood, SW 19) on 2nd, 3rd & 5th 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 1st Sunday); 4.00 p.m. Evening Prayer (Holy Communion 3rd Sunday). Tuesdays (only in term time): 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, *'Intercessions'*.

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. 01547 528 815.

MATERIAL FOR MAY ISSUE BY 20th MARCH, 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.