

Scottish Episcopal Institute Journal



Spring 2022 — Volume 6.1

*A quarterly journal for debate on current issues
in the Anglican Communion and beyond*

ISSN 2399-8989

Scottish Episcopal Institute Journal

The 'Saint Andrew Declaration' was signed with fanfare on St Andrew's Day 2021 in Edinburgh by Mark Strange, Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness and Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and James Wallace, Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. This number of the *Journal* attends to related historical and theological issues. This number is all the more relevant with the May 2022 signing of the St Margaret Declaration between the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of Scotland.

ARTICLES

- The Saint Andrew Declaration: A Shared History and a Shared Faith?
Stephen Mark Holmes 7
- Presbyterians and Episcopalians: A Shared History in Scotland
from a Presbyterian Perspective
Alasdair J. Macleod 27
- Order, Ministry and Sacraments in the Church of Scotland
Teri Peterson and Martin Ritchie 41
- Sacraments and Ministry in the Scottish Episcopal Church
John Reuben Davies and Nicholas Taylor 69
- The Ecclesiology of the Scottish Episcopal Church
Emsley Nimmo 81
- Presbyterian Church Government (by Divine Right)
John W. Keddie 103
- The Church of Scotland and the Authority of Scripture
Andrew T. B. McGowan 117
- The Scottish Episcopal Church
David Jasper 129

REVIEWS

- Douglas Galbraith, *Assist our Song: Music Ministries in the Local Church*
Reviewed by Roberta Ritson 137
- Eric Stoddart, *The Common Gaze: Surveillance and the Common Good*
Reviewed by W. John Carswell 139
- Richard Morris, *Evensong: People, Discoveries and Reflections on the Church in England*
Reviewed by David Jasper 140
- Robert S. Heaney, K. John Kafwanka, Hilda Kabia, eds, *God's Church for God's World: A Practical Approach to Partnership in Mission*
Reviewed by Nicholas Taylor 124

Enquiries

Enquires to the Revd Dr Michael Hull
Scottish Episcopal Institute
21 Grosvenor Crescent
Edinburgh EH12 5EE
Scotland–UK
0131-225-6357
dos@scotland.anglican.org

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

The author of each article published here owns his or her own words. The articles in the *Scottish Episcopal Journal* may be freely redistributed in other media and non-commercial publications as long as the article is not abridged, edited or altered in any way without the express consent of the author. A redistributed article may not be sold for profit or included in another medium or publication that is sold for profit without the express consent of the author. The articles in the *Scottish Episcopal Journal* may be included in commercial publication or other media only if prior consent for republication is received from the author. The author may request compensation for republication for commercial use.

Volume 6.1 — Spring 2022 — ISSN 2399-8989

Revised Thursday 26 May 2022

Sacraments and Ministry in the Scottish Episcopal Church

John Reuben Davies

Research Fellow, School of Humanities, University of Glasgow
Associate Tutor, Scottish Episcopal Institute
Member, Liturgy Committee of the Faith and Order Board

Nicholas Taylor

Rector, St Aidan's, Clarkston
Associate Tutor, Scottish Episcopal Institute
Convenor, Liturgy Committee of the Faith and Order Board

The Scottish Episcopal Church finds its origins in the end of the Stuart monarchy, when those holding to Episcopacy found themselves excluded and expelled from the Church of Scotland as non-Jurors. And it was the sacraments and ministry, as expressed through liturgy and episcopacy, which especially defined Scottish Episcopacy against Presbyterianism.¹

From the beginning, the essential and defining position of Episcopalians was their commitment to an episcopal polity and opposition to presbyterian government of the Church. Episcopalians nevertheless co-existed within one Church of Scotland, with no separate ecclesial identity from the Presbyterians, until the revolution of 1688 and its consequences played out with the deposition of James VII in 1689. The Scottish bishops were not prepared to break the oaths they had made to King James, which they viewed as inviolable so long as James had not abdicated. Hence

¹ Recent work on the earlier history of Scottish Episcopacy forms an edited collection in *Scottish Church History*, 47 (2018), drawn on in Rowan Strong's excellent theological survey of the period, 'Episcopalian theology 1689–c.1900', in *The History of Scottish Theology, Volume II: From the Early Enlightenment to the Late Victorian Era*, ed. by David Fergusson and Mark Elliott (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 265–83. See also Alasdair Raffe, *The Culture of Controversy: Religious Arguments in Scotland 1660–1714* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012); Rowan Strong, *Episcopalianism in Nineteenth-Century Scotland: Religious Responses to a Modernising Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Episcopalians were gradually evicted from the Church of Scotland, which was now officially Presbyterian in its government and ministry.²

Until this point, few Scottish Episcopalians espoused a theology of *iure diuino* or divine-right episcopacy against the predominant presbyterian theology. Divine-right episcopacy — advocated in early seventeenth-century England by Richard Bancroft, Thomas Barlow, and William Laud — affirmed that episcopacy was by divine, not human right, and that the king had supremacy in matters ecclesiastical. And so, before 1689, the Episcopalian defence of episcopal government had tended to rely on arguments based on the royal will as the supreme head of the Church. Presbyterians opposed this position on the grounds that the headship of the Church belonged properly to Christ.³

The early years of the eighteenth century saw growing division among non-juring bishops over the extent of royal authority in the Episcopal polity. An older party of bishops favoured a form of ecclesiastical government by the bishops acting collectively, as a college. This ‘college’ party, also held to the nomination of bishops by the Stuart monarch. The newer bishops, consecrated since 1705, argued for a diocesan structure, and for episcopal election by the diocesan clergy.

In addition to the differences over ministry, a controversy over the administration of the Sacrament of Holy Communion also emerged around this time too. Four ‘ancient Usages’, absent from the English Book of Common Prayer of 1662, had by 1716 become a point of dispute. The diocesan party of bishops, mostly influenced by English non-Jurors, advocated the practice of these four ‘ancient Usages’: the mixing of water with the wine in the chalice; prayers for the dead; the epiclesis (or invocation of the Holy Spirit over the elements) in the Eucharistic prayer; and the prayer of oblation in the Eucharistic prayer.⁴ To these four usages, one ought

² Until 1792, the only Episcopalians to whom public worship was allowed were those who ‘qualified’ according to the Scottish Episcopalians Act 1711. ‘Qualification’ involved the use of the English Book of Common Prayer (1662) and, most importantly, praying by name for the protestant sovereigns (William and Mary, Anne, and Georges I, II and III), especially at the ‘Collects for the King’, and the prayer for ‘Christ’s Church Militant here in earth’.

³ An account of the issues is provided in Raffe, *Culture of Controversy*, pp. 34–37.

⁴ For the English background, see *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey*, ed. by Charles Hefling and Cynthia Shattuck (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 403–07.

also to add the reservation of the sacrament for the sick.⁵ The position of the diocesan pro-usages party — known as ‘Usagers’ — was that the Usages were primitive and apostolic, and that they were therefore essential elements of the liturgical tradition. Tradition was authoritative where biblical warrant was not explicit. Those opposed to the Usages, who inhabited the ‘college’ party, held to an exclusively scriptural standard, asserting that Scripture had revealed all necessary elements of church life.⁶

The leading apologist and promoter of the Usages and the diocesan system was Bishop Thomas Rattray (1684 to 1743), who was largely responsible for shaping Episcopalian sacramental theology and ecclesiology.⁷ Rattray not only supported the introduction of the Usages, but produced a translation of the Liturgy of St James, set out for liturgical as well as scholarly use.⁸ His enduring legacy was his influence on the Scottish Communion Office.⁹ Indeed, Rattray’s work on the Liturgy of St James could be seen as ‘a significant step in the direction of a definitive Scottish Liturgy [...] the precipitating factor in producing the 1764 Liturgy, and the chief single influence upon it’.¹⁰

The liturgy for the Eucharist became a defining element of Episcopalian identity. Rattray’s sacramental theology, which influenced the development of the Scottish Communion Office in the eighteenth century, closely was associated with the English non-Jurors’ 1718 revision of the Eucharistic liturgy of the Book of Common Prayer, and expressed a theology of eucharistic non-corporeal sacrifice, supporting a real presence of Christ in the Eucharist by the virtue and power of the presence of Christ through

⁵ See Nicholas Taylor, ‘Liturgy and theological method in the Scottish Episcopal Church, *Scottish Church History*, 47 (2018), 143–54 (pp. 147–50).

⁶ See Robert D. Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic: The Constitution of the Church in High Church Anglican and Non-Juror Thought* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1993), pp. 50–54.

⁷ See Rowan Strong, ‘Rattray, Thomas, of Craighall (1684–1743)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) [accessed 11 March 2022].

⁸ ‘Order for celebrating the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist’, in *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem* (London, 1744), pp. 113–22.

⁹ W. Douglas Kornahrens, *Bishop Thomas Rattray and his Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem*, Joint Liturgical Studies 92 (Norwich: Hymns Ancient and Modern, 2021).

¹⁰ Wallace Douglas Kornahrens, ‘Eucharistic Doctrine in Scottish Episcopacy, 1620–1875’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of St Andrews, 2008), p. 13.

the Holy Spirit.¹¹ In the Scottish Communion Office of 1764, Christ's 'one oblation of himself once offered' (from the English order) became his 'own oblation of himself once offered'. This modification allowed for an interpretation that included Christ's sacrificial self-offering being made not only on the Cross, but also in the Last Supper and the Eucharist.¹² Christ's presence in the sacrament was independent of the believer's faith.¹³

By the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, however, Episcopalian theologians were moving away from the English non-juring position, maintaining that the Eucharist is not a sacrifice, but a 'feast upon a sacrifice'. Some, such as Bishop Alexander Jolly (1756 to 1838), meanwhile, did maintain that the Eucharist is commemorative of the redeeming sacrifice of Christ and therefore sacrificial language was appropriate.¹⁴

In the third quarter of the nineteenth century, the influence of Tractarian theology produced the 'Eucharistic Controversy' in what was now a fully emancipated Scottish Episcopal ecclesial polity, with seven dioceses. In 1857, Patrick Cheyne (1794 to 1878), the incumbent of St John the Evangelist, Aberdeen, used a series of Lenten sermons to argue against the eighteenth-century Episcopalian eucharistic theology, and in favour of 'a Real, Objective Presence' of Christ.¹⁵ The Bishop of Aberdeen suspended Cheyne from his office as a priest until he renounced the teaching in his sermons.¹⁶

Alexander Penrose Forbes (1817 to 1875), Bishop of Brechin (1857 to 1875), who supported Cheyne when he appealed to the Episcopal Synod,

¹¹ *A Communion Office, Taken Partly from Primitive Liturgies, And Partly from the First English Reformed Common-Prayer-Book: Together with Offices for Confirmation, and the Visitation of the Sick* (London, 1718).

¹² *Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer*, ed. by Hefling and Shattuck, p. 410.

¹³ The most influential supporting work was by John Johnson (1662 to 1725, an English juring High Church sacramental theologian, sympathetic to the non-Jurors), in *The Unbloody Sacrifice, and Altar, Unvail'd and Supported: In Which the Nature of the Eucharist is Explain'd*, 2 parts (London: Robert Knaplock, 1714–1718).

¹⁴ Strong, 'Episcopalian theology', p. 271.

¹⁵ Patrick Cheyne, *Six Sermons on the Doctrine of the Most Holy Eucharist* (Aberdeen: A. Brown, 1858).

¹⁶ Cheyne's sentence was cancelled four years after his condemnation, when he gave the Bishop of Aberdeen a satisfactory explanation of the disputed passages in his sermons: Gibb N. Pennie, 'The trial of the Rev. Patrick Cheyne for Erroneous Teaching on the Eucharist in Aberdeen in 1858', *Scottish Church History Society*, 23 (1987), 77–93.

was the most prominent theologian of the Scottish Episcopal Church during the mid-nineteenth century. Forbes, in his first charge to his diocesan clergy, also expounded an objective understanding of the eucharistic presence of Christ. In fact, Forbes argued (in line with the theology implicit in the Scottish Communion Office) that the sacrifice of Christ was not limited to the Cross, but embraced the whole of his life lived sacrificially in obedience to his Father, so that as the living and glorified Christ he was able to re-present this sacrifice to the Father.¹⁷ Forbes also supported the adoration of the eucharistic elements: 'Either Christ is present, or He is not. If He is, He ought to be adored; if He is not, *cadit quaestio*'.¹⁸ And he posed the rhetorical question to his clergy, why Saint Paul in 1 Corinthians should have regarded unworthy reception as a serious matter if the wicked only merely received bread and wine and not Christ.¹⁹ Finally, Forbes upheld the Scottish Communion Office, because he saw that liturgy as more supportive of his eucharistic theology compared with the Book of Common Prayer's Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion.

In 1865 Alexander Penrose Forbes produced *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία* [The Divine Liturgy]: *The Scottish Communion Office done into Greek* (London: Joseph Masters, 1865).²⁰ The book was indirectly related to a dispute surrounding the Scottish Communion Office that had been going on since before Forbes was elected to the see of Brechin, a controversy which had come to a head at the Episcopal Church's Synod of 1863.²¹ In the Code of Canons of 1811, Canon XV was intended to secure 'the primary authority' of the Scottish Communion Office as the authorised service of the church in the administration of the Holy Communion, while it ratified the permission previously granted by the bishops to retain the English Office in all

¹⁷ Alexander Penrose Forbes, *Primary Charge delivered to the Clergy of his Diocese at the Annual Synod* (London: Joseph Masters, 1857), pp. 39–42; Strong, 'Episcopalian theology', p. 277.

¹⁸ Forbes, *Primary Charge*, p. 31.

¹⁹ Forbes, *Primary Charge*, p. 26–29.

²⁰ For what follows, see John Reuben Davies, 'The Brothers Forbes and the liturgical books of medieval Scotland: Historical scholarship and liturgical controversy in the nineteenth-century Scottish Episcopal Church', *Scottish Church History*, 47 (2018), 128–42.

²¹ See, for example, J. Marshall, *Fragment of a Brief Defence of the Scottish Communion Office against the Attacks of the Rev. Edward Craig, the Rev. D. T. K. Drummond, and others* (Edinburgh, 1843). For a full account of Alexander Forbes's involvement in the controversy, see Rowan Strong, *Alexander Forbes of Brechin: The First Tractarian Bishop* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 101–58.

congregations where it had been in use. The Scottish Communion Office was nevertheless to be used at the consecration of bishops; and every bishop was required to give his assent to it.

The Scottish Communion Office, it should be remembered, was still that of 1764, with no specific naming of the monarch. The prayer of consecration had an epiclesis, which, like the non-juring Communion Office of 1718, came in the 'Eastern position', after the words of institution, rather than, as in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI (1549), before. The English Communion Office was that of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England.²²

During the early 1860s, using Gladstone's powerful political support, Bishop Forbes was leading a campaign to save the use of the Scottish Communion Office, now used by only a minority of Episcopalians, from being repudiated in favour of the English Book of Common Prayer. In the decisive Synod of 1863, it was enacted through Canon XXIX that the English Book of Common Prayer 'is, and shall be held to be, the Service Book of this Church for all the purposes to which it is applicable'. Forbes's limited measure of success, however, was that under Canon XXX the use of the Scottish Communion Office was allowed in any congregations whose existing practice had been to use it.²³

In 1912, however, the Scottish Episcopal Church acquired its own Book of Common Prayer, which incorporated the Scottish Communion Office or The Scottish Liturgy. A definitive version of the Scottish Book of Common Prayer, which shared some significant material with the Church of England's 'Deposited' book of 1928, was published in 1929, and remains in use today.

In October 1966 the College of Bishops authorised their own revised text of the Scottish Liturgy 1929, which simply incorporated most of the permissive variations which had been authorised since the Synod of 1960–61. This revised liturgy took final form as the Scottish Liturgy 1970 and retained the key elements of the Scottish liturgical tradition, in the epiclesis (positioned after the institution narrative and anamnesis) and the eucharistic oblation. One reason put forward for retaining the epiclesis, at the time losing favour in Anglicanism, was that the Church of Scotland's Book of Common Order (1940) contains an epiclesis similar to the Church of South

²² William Jardine Grisbrooke, *Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, Alcuin Club Collections 40 (London, 1958), chap. 19.

²³ 'Ecclesiastical Law and the Code of Canons', in *Scottish Episcopal Church: Code of Canons 2017* (Edinburgh, 2017), pp. 5–31 (p. 11).

India's liturgy.²⁴ During the succeeding decade, however, the pace of liturgical change increased, and in 1977 the *Experimental Liturgy 1977* was recommended by the Provincial Synod (as the General Synod was then known) for authorisation by the College of Bishops, and was the first Scottish Episcopal text to address God as 'you'. This experimental rite was superseded in 1982 by the definitive *Scottish Liturgy 1982*, which continues as the principal liturgical form for most congregations in the SEC. The text of this rite has been dynamic, subject to periodic revisions to accommodate refinements in language and broadening of the tradition to include provision for seasons of the ecclesiastical year.²⁵ The process of liturgical renewal is continuing and will undoubtedly see further enrichment of the tradition during the coming years.

Although there are antecedents, the COVID-19 pandemic revealed an apparently widespread desire for online eucharistic worship — and even remote consecration and reception of the eucharistic elements — which manifested during the period when public worship was restricted or prohibited.²⁶ This is suggestive of two, inter-connected, developments in Western culture: individualism and consumerism. The avoidance or disregard of community, which is of the essence of the Eucharist as an act of the gathered body of Christ, reflects perhaps an area of long-running neglect in the Church's teaching. This has allowed the intellectual and spiritual space to emerge within which modern and postmodern Christians have developed a privatised spirituality, in which liturgical piety that concentrates on the reception of Holy Communion, and its benefits to the individual. Not only is the corporate dimension of Christian identity neglected, but the worshipper

²⁴ *Modern Anglican Liturgies 1958–1968*, ed. by Colin Buchanan (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 150.

²⁵ There have been revisions involving the addition of seasonal Eucharistic Prayers (Christmas, Epiphany, and Creation) and inclusive language, in 1996 and in 2021/22. This work is ongoing.

²⁶ John Reuben Davies, 'Eucharist, Church, and judgment: initial questions about the liturgical and ecclesiological implications of the COVID-19 pandemic', in *Church, Ministry, and Coronavirus*, ed. by Nicholas Taylor, *Scottish Episcopal Institute Journal*, 4.2 (Summer 2020), 71–83; for antecedent expressions of this phenomenon, see Nicholas Taylor, *Lay Presidency at the Eucharist? An Anglican Approach* (London: Bloomsbury, 2009), pp. 142–76. This may be linked to the phenomenon of 'believing without belonging', described by Grace Davie, *Religion in Britain: A Persistent Paradox*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2015), pp. 71–90, as well as to individualism and consumerism, and the unwillingness (and/or fear) to interact with others.

ceases to be an active participant in the priesthood of all believers, either in worship or in going out into the world ‘to love and serve the Lord’. As is explicitly stated in the text of the liturgy, and is accordingly the doctrine of the Church, the Eucharist is a corporate act of sacrifice, wherein worshippers unite themselves with Christ, offer the gifts of bread and wine to God, ‘and with them ourselves, a single, holy, living sacrifice’.²⁷ The theology of the Eucharistic Prayers in *Scottish Liturgy 1982* emphasises not the personal benefits of reception, but the commitment of the Communicant to participation in the saving work of Christ in the world. This represents some development from the more individualistic piety reflected in the orders for the administration of Holy Communion in the *Scottish Book of Common Prayer* (1929) and *Scottish Liturgy 1970*, and from the Anglican custom of an early morning celebration of the Eucharist, without music or sermon, at which congregants were wont to be scattered as widely as possible in the space available, and at no point to acknowledge each other. The renewed emphasis on the corporate essence of the Eucharist has been a valuable insight from the liturgical movement of the past century, and a necessary corrective to practices which had taken hold in many places, and one which the restrictions imposed on account of the pandemic, and the fears and anxieties generated thereby, must not be permitted to erode. The Eucharist is not for passive reception, but for active participation.

The preceding discussion has intimated several aspects of the liturgical tradition of the SEC which merit further elaboration. It is a truism of Anglican theology that doctrine is expressed definitively in worship, and not in statements or declarations issued by ecclesiastical bodies, current or historical. Worship is the context in which Scripture is received, and the texts of the authorised liturgies reflect truly, if not systematically, the teaching of the Church. This principle was reaffirmed in 2017 when Canon 31 was revised, removing the opening statement, ‘The doctrine of marriage [...]’, on the grounds that, irrespective of whether marriage between consenting adults of the same sex was to be permitted, the Code of Canons is not the appropriate vehicle for doctrine.

The Scottish Episcopal Church does not operate in isolation either from other parts of the Anglican Communion, or from its ecumenical partners in Scotland, Britain and Ireland, Europe, and globally. On the

²⁷ *Scottish Liturgy 1982*, Eucharistic Prayers I–IV; Eucharistic Prayer V reads, ‘Together with him we offer you these gifts: in them we give you ourselves’; *Scottish Liturgy 1970*, together with the *Scottish Book of Common Prayer*, has, ‘And here we humbly offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee’.

contrary, theological reflection on sacraments and ministry has quite consciously been prosecuted in an ecumenical context for the past several decades, the St Andrews Declaration representing a phase in a process which has proved costly and potentially divisive, but to which the Church remains unequivocally committed. The influence of both pan-Anglican and ecumenical movements may be discerned in the background to the processes of liturgical renewal which have been under way for the past several decades. The second Vatican Council (1962 to 1965) has provided perhaps the most significant impetus for renewal, not only in the Roman Catholic Church but for global Christianity. Its wider influence may be attributed in part at least to the ecumenical movement, consolidated and reinvigorated through the formation of the World Council of Churches in 1946. This has been far more significant than the real or alleged crypto-romanism detected in some Anglicans, especially as the reforms of Vatican II precipitated something of a crisis for conservatives of both communions.

While the Roman Catholic Church has never joined the WCC, it has engaged fully in many of its activities, not least the Commission on Faith and Order. The publication in 1982 of *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*,²⁸ commonly known as the Lima Document, expressed a degree of 'convergence' in theological thinking between churches of diverse history, tradition, and cultural context, including those whose founding documents reflected the bitter theological disputes and enduring enmities of the European Reformation and its aftermath. Over the ensuing decade, churches responded to *BEM*, which responses were published in several volumes. That of the SEC appears in Vol. 2 of *Churches Respond to BEM*.²⁹ This expresses substantial agreement with *BEM* on baptism, and notes that, as the rite of incorporation into Christ it has ecumenical implications which have not been realised. Noting that baptism precedes admission to Communion, the SEC registered this issue as a potential impediment to unity with any denomination which admitted unbaptised people to Communion. On the Eucharist, the SEC Response notes the compatibility of *BEM* and the ARCIC (1) Final Report concerning the Real Presence and affirms that sufficient agreement has been reached in eucharistic faith and practice to remove any obstacles to unity. On Ministry, the SEC Response to *BEM* draws attention to its essential agreement with Vatican II in emphasising the calling of the whole people of God, and to the 'coherence' between *BEM* and the ARCIC (1) Final Report on ministry and ordination. On the interconnectedness of the priesthood of the faithful and of that of the ordained

²⁸ *Faith and Order Paper 111* [accessed 19 December 2021].

²⁹ Ed. by Max Thurian; *Faith and Order Paper 132*, pp. 48–56 [accessed 11 March 2022].

ministry, the Response cites with approval the Vatican II Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. While affirming its commitment to the historic episcopate, the SEC also recognised that the quest for Christian unity could not require any denomination to repudiate its own heritage. Differences in doctrine of ministry remain challenges to Christian unity, but a common subscription to *BEM* would represent significant progress in this direction. The Response also identifies two outstanding issues requiring further work, in both of which areas there has been significant development in the SEC over the ensuing decades: admission of the baptised to Communion before Confirmation, and the order of Deacons.

In the decades following *BEM* and the response of the churches to it, the SEC has seen considerable liturgical renewal in the areas of baptism and the Eucharist, with accompanying changes in discipline to affirm that baptism is the right (as well as the rite) of admission to Communion; confirmation has become essentially a rite of affirming baptismal promises, and remains a prerequisite to ordination, but not to admission to Communion or to holding any lay office in the church. This is reflected in Christian Initiation 1998, subsequently replaced with Holy Baptism 2006 and Affirmation of Holy Baptism (for Confirmation and Renewal) 2006. The order for the Eucharist, Scottish Liturgy 1982, has been subject to periodic revision and expansion, which is ongoing, while earlier rites of 1929 (preserving post-Reformation Scottish traditions) and 1970 (a blend of Scottish usage and the fruit of Anglican and Roman Catholic liturgical renewal) remain in use. The sacraments have, however, not been subject to systematic theological reflection or reporting by the Doctrine Committee, but the Liturgy Committee has been rigorous in its preparations for revision of specific rites.³⁰

It is in ministry that substantial theological and practical work has been undertaken within the structures of the SEC. The Diaconal Working Group has continued to reflect, advise, and support the work of vocational

³⁰ See *Towards Liturgical Renewal in the Scottish Episcopal Church*, ed. by John Reuben Davies, *Scottish Episcopal Institute Journal*, 3.4 (Winter 2019). Members of the Committee have also published substantial works in this area: David Jasper, *The Sacred Community* (Waco TX: Baylor University Press, 2012); *The Language of Liturgy: A Ritual Poetics* (London: SCM, 2018); Nicholas Taylor, *Lay Presidency at the Eucharist?; Paul on Baptism* (London: SCM, 2016). See also the discussion of Jasper's contribution in *The Language of Liturgy*, ed. by Nicholas Taylor, *Scottish Episcopal Institute Journal*, 3.2 (Summer 2019).

Deacons in the church.³¹ The Diaconate has also been the subject of considerable reflection by members of the Doctrine and Liturgy Committees.³² The Episcopate has similarly been subject to rigorous and controversial theological reflection by the Doctrine Committee,³³ at a time when the exercise of that office has proved controversial in some parts of this church. While no equivalent study of the presbyterate has yet been undertaken, the Doctrine Committee brought together diverse strands of research and reflection in *Theology of Authority in the Ministry of the Church*.³⁴ While this is not the definitive statement of the SEC, or of its Doctrine Committee, it does seek to consolidate the fruit of research and reflection to date, and to become the basis for further theological reflection on the church and its ministry.

The SEC attaches considerable value to ‘evangelical truth and apostolic order’, as is emphasised in the emblem which adorns its ‘pub sign’ and all official documents. While assent to ‘evangelical truth’ may appear little more than lip-service to conservative critics, ‘apostolic order’ is central to thinking about liturgy and the sacraments, and to ministry. While the authorised liturgies of the SEC are subject to a process of constant renewal, in which the work of the Liturgy Committee is commissioned and supervised by the Faith and Order Board, scrutinised by the College of Bishops, and ultimately subject to the authority of General Synod,³⁵ it is quite consciously rooted in the ancient traditions of the Church catholic — not in the

³¹ *Truly Called by God to Serve as a Deacon: The Report of the Bishops’ Working Group on the Distinctive Diaconate* (1987); *Truly Called ... 2* (Diaconal Working Group, 2012).

³² *The Diaconate*, ed. by John Reuben Davies, *Scottish Episcopal Institute Journal*, 4.4 (Winter 2020).

³³ *The Episcopate*, ed. by David Jasper, *Scottish Episcopal Institute Journal*, 2.4 (Winter 2018).

³⁴ *Grosvenor Essay 13* (Edinburgh: General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church, 2020).

³⁵ As stipulated in Canon 22, new rites or revisions to existing rites are subject to the same Synodical processes as are required for alteration to the Canons of the SEC. This requires a majority vote at first reading, followed by referral to Diocesan Synods for comment, before a second reading at which a two-thirds majority is required, with General Synod voting by houses. This process normally follows a period of several years during which material, once approved by the Faith & Order Board, is authorised by the College of Bishops for experimental use, during which feedback may be received by the Liturgy Committee and incorporated into revisions preceding commencement of the Synodical process.

archaeological sense beloved by liturgists of the past century obsessed with finding contemporary use for any and every text discovered, nor in the narrow sense of clinging to Scottish particularities, but rejoicing to inhabit a living and dynamic tradition of worship. The distinctive orders of ministry are similarly cherished, not merely as theologically grounded human agencies of divine grace, and a corrective to the crass and exploitative managerialism which has become fashionable, but as embodying continuity with the work of the apostles of Christ — not in the sense of perpetuating the discredited ‘conduit pipe’ fantasy of unbroken lineage asserted by seventeenth century Ordinals and fetishized by some Anglo-Catholics, with the view to delegitimizing the ministries of other Christian denominations. Much as we value continuity with ancient tradition, this consists in faithfully transmitting that which we have received, the Gospel proclaimed by the apostles, and the ordering of the corporate life and worship of the body of Christ, and especially in celebrating the sacraments as instituted by Christ. This is not a matter of legalistic preoccupation with peripherea, but of freely sharing a gift which we have freely received, but which we have also preserved at considerable cost.