

A History of Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles

Mark D. Thompson

It was always intended that those in responsible positions in the church and in government would subscribe to the Articles. This was nothing out of the ordinary. On the Continent, Lutherans and Calvinists required their clergy to subscribe to their confessions at their ordination. Calvin famously expected all citizens of Geneva to swear an oath of allegiance to the Reformed faith as set out in the *Genevan Confession* (1536).¹ From 1564, the Roman Church required its ordinands to subscribe to the Tridentine Profession of Faith, the so-called ‘Creed of Pius IV’.² We have already noted that by 1549 Cranmer was requiring all who sought a preaching licence from him to sign a declaration of faith.

When the Forty-two Articles were published in June 1553, King Edward sent copies to each of the bishops along with a mandate for subscription. This document makes clear what the king, and presumably Cranmer, had in mind. A copy of the mandate sent to Thomas Thirlby, Bishop of Norwich survives. It begins:—

Right Reverend Father in God, right trusty and well-beloved, we greet you well. And because it hath pleased Almighty God in this latter time of the world, after long darkness of knowledge, to reveal to this his Church of England, whereof we have under Christ the chief charge in earth, a sincere knowledge of the Gospel, to the inestimable benefit of us and our people, redeemed by our Saviour Christ: We have thought it meet and our duty, for the pure conservation of the same Gospel in our Church, with one uniform profession, doctrine and preaching, and for the avoiding of many perilous and vain opinions and errors, to send unto you certain Articles, devised and gathered with great study, and by counsel and good advice of the greatest learned part of our bishops of this realm, and sundry others of our clergy; which Articles we will and exhort yourself to subscribe, and in your preachings, readings, and teachings to observe, and cause to be subscribed and observed of all other, which do, or hereafter shall preach, or read, within your diocese.³

Subscription was meant to ensure that the clergy and officers of the state understood, believed and were committed to protect the doctrinal basis of the English church. It was a means of achieving doctrinal uniformity, particularly amongst those who were charged with teaching the faith or who might make decisions affecting the life of the churches. Elizabeth was known to object to such legislation, presumably because of a potential reaction and subsequent division within the kingdom. Once again her precarious international situation and awkward domestic circumstances rendered such a measure imprudent. But in the 1570s, partly in reaction to more insistent and vociferous criticism of the religious settlement by those of a more Presbyterian persuasion, she would acquiesce.

In 1571 the parliament passed the Subscription Act (13 Elizabeth c. 12). It threatened deprivation to anyone who refused to declare assent and subscribe to the Articles. It also outlined what was required before a person could take up an appointment to a parish in England.

And that no person shall hereafter be admitted to any benefice with cure, except he then be of the age of three and twenty years at least and a deacon, and shall first have subscribed the said Articles in presence of the ordinary, and publicly read the same in the parish church of that benefice, with declaration of his unfeigned assent to the same....⁴ Assent to the articles was to be a public affair and the practice of ‘reading yourself in’ to a parochial charge was meant to become standard throughout the realm. Similar provisions were made for all preachers by the canons enacted that same year.⁵ In 1584 the new Archbishop of Canterbury, John Whitgift, sought to strengthen the requirement. All bishops were to examine candidates for ordination, ensuring that each could give an account of his faith ‘in the Latin tongue...according to the articles of religion agreed upon in convocation, and that in such sort as he can note the sentences of Scripture whereupon the truth of the said articles is grounded’.⁶ Such a requirement was no doubt meant to strengthen one’s sense of the biblical orientation of the Articles.

The most enduring form of subscription to the Articles is that which is found in the Canons of 1604. The canons gave three clauses or articles to which anyone wishing to be ordained must subscribe. The first concerned the royal

supremacy, the second concerned the Book of Common Prayer and the Ordinal, and the third concerned the Thirty-nine Articles.

That he alloweth the book of articles of religion agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy in the convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord God one thousand five hundred sixty and two; and that he acknowledgeth all and every the articles therein contained, being in number nine and thirty, besides the ratification, to be agreeable to the Word of God.

In light of this the subscription took the following form: ‘I [N.N.] do willingly and *ex animo* subscribe to these three articles above mentioned, and to all things that are contained in them.’⁷

There can be no doubt that the intention was to close off every available loophole. All the articles, ‘all and every’, are to be acknowledged to be ‘agreeable to the Word of God’. This was calculated to exclude the Presbyterians, since Article 36 insisted that there was nothing superstitious or ungodly in the Ordinal and so endorsed the threefold order of Bishops, Priests and Deacons. But more than all that, the subscription was to be made ‘willingly and *ex animo*’, meaning ‘willingly and from the heart’. Subscription was a serious business.

With such an obligation on teachers of God’s people (and others besides: holders of public office and those matriculating to one of the universities were required to subscribe as well) could we not reasonably expect doctrinal uniformity in the Church of England? It appears that even in the seventeenth century there were difficulties. Evidence for this comes from the Royal Declaration which Archbishop William Laud (of all people!) composed and with royal permission had published as a Preface to the Articles in 1628. Why would these words be necessary if there was not already a phenomenon of novel or eccentric reading of the Articles?

That, therefore, in these both curious and unhappy differences, which have for so many hundred years, in different times and places exercised the Church of Christ, We will, that all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God’s promises, as they be generally set forth

to us in the holy Scriptures, and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England according to them. And that no man hereafter shall either print or preach to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof: and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense.

That if any public Reader in either of Our Universities, or any Head or Master of a College, or any other person respectively in either of them, shall affix any new sense to any Article, or shall publicly read, determine, or hold any public Disputation, or suffer any such to be held either way, in either the Universities or Colleges respectively; or if any Divine in the Universities shall preach or print any thing either way, other than is already established in Convocation with our Royal Assent, he, or they the Offenders, shall be liable to our displeasure, and the Church's censure in Our Commission Ecclesiastical, as well as any other: And we will see there shall be due Execution upon them.⁸

A clear statement of Protestant and Reformed doctrine was not enough. Legally enforceable subscription to the Articles was not enough. The preface envisages the danger of reading the Articles 'against the grain' as it were, glossing them or interpreting them in ways other than 'the literal and grammatical sense'. Laud, a High Churchman who vigorously opposed Puritanism within the Church of England, nevertheless insisted that the Articles meant what they said.

Subscription to the Articles continued into the early Commonwealth period but lapsed as the canon law and indeed episcopacy was abolished by the republican parliament. However, the Articles and the canon law which required unfeigned subscription to them were reinstated following the restoration of the monarchy and the episcopate in 1660. The Book of Common Prayer, with a few small but nonetheless significant amendments, was reissued in 1662. The body of canon law was effective again soon after.

We should not think, though, that subscription to the Articles was non-controversial. Besides those who refused to subscribe and so were deprived of their ministries, there were others who, though they had subscribed, felt the

Articles constrained them in unhelpful ways. At various times over the next three hundred years murmurings were heard against the policy of subscription but once again political expediency played as much a role in preserving the practice as heartfelt theological conviction. In the eighteenth century, for instance, England had to be protected from the Jacobite threat to the Hanoverian succession. What would happen, though, when political necessity was no longer a factor?

The practice of subscription to the Articles was significantly undermined by developments in the nineteenth century. In the 1830s a group of Oxford academics, initially spurred into action by what they saw as an illegitimate interference by the State in the affairs of the church — the parliament had decided to rearrange the ecclesiastical landscape in Ireland — began to publish the *Tracts for the Times*. They emphasised the catholic character of the Church of England, embraced a number of catholic practices and defended some long-abandoned catholic doctrines such as that of the ‘apostolic succession’ of bishops. This series of tracts culminated in the famous Tract 90 entitled ‘Remarks on Certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles’. It was written by John Henry Newman (soon to leave the Church of England for the Roman Catholic Church and currently being considered for sainthood) and published on 25 January 1841. The most controversial, and subsequently most influential sentence from the tract occurs in its conclusion:

In the first place, it is a *duty* which we owe both to the Catholic Church and to our own, to take our reformed confessions in the most Catholic sense they will admit: we have no duties toward their framers.⁹

It sounds almost postmodern and a generation which has little time for authorial intention might view it in a different light than those who first read it. Newman’s intention, on the other hand, is quite clear throughout the document. He was seeking to justify subscription to the Articles while retaining or recovering perspectives and practices which the reformers repeatedly opposed. But what of the Royal Declaration which Archbishop Laud had added and continued to be printed with the Articles? What of the obligation to read the articles ‘in the literal and grammatical sense’? Newman had an answer for that question as well.

Whatever be the authority of the [Declaration] prefixed to the Articles, so

far as it has any weight at all, it sanctions the mode of interpreting them above given. For its injoining the ‘literal and grammatical sense,’ relieves us from the necessity of making the known opinions of their framers, a comment upon their text; and its forbidding any person to ‘affix any *new* sense to any Article,’ was promulgated at a time when the leading men of our Church were especially noted for those Catholic views which have been here advocated.¹⁰

It is the text of the Articles which is authoritative, Newman insisted, not an interpretation of that text which is shaped by what we know from elsewhere about the author’s theological convictions. However, somewhat in tension with this argument, Newman then goes on to insist that we know—presumably from outside the text — that leading subscribers to the text in the sixteenth century were men of Catholic sensibility. This is a point he would take further.

...their framers constructed them in such a way as best to comprehend those who did not go so far in Protestantism as themselves. Anglo-Catholics then are but the successors and representatives of those moderate reformers; and their case has been directly anticipated in the wording of the Articles. It follows that they are not perverting, they are using them, for an express purpose for which among others their authors framed them. The interpretation they take was intended to be admissible; though not that which their authors took themselves. Had it not been provided for, possibly the Articles never would have been accepted by our Church at all. If, then, their framers have gained their side of the compact in effecting the reception of the Articles, let Catholics have theirs too in retaining their own Catholic interpretation of them.¹¹

Newman was not merely anticipating the literary criticism of the late twentieth century. This was not a disinterested treatise in the interpretation of an early modern text. Newman himself had a clear agenda and his search for room to differ from reformation theology while subscribing to the Articles is most apparent in a paragraph found in the middle of the conclusion to the tract.

...the Articles are evidently framed on the principle of leaving open large questions, on which the controversy hinges. They state broadly extreme truths, and are silent about their adjustment. For instance, they say that all

necessary faith must be proved from Scripture, but do not say *who* is to prove it. They say that the Church has authority in controversies, they do not say *what* authority. They say that it may not enforce anything beyond Scripture, but do not say *where* the remedy lies when it does. They say that works *before* grace and justification are worthless and worse, and that works *after* grace and justification are acceptable, but they do not speak at all of works with GOD's aid, *before* justification...¹²

Whatever the propriety or otherwise of Newman's endeavour, the eventual impact of his argument, though controversial at the time, was to encourage those who wished to view the Articles as other than as 'uncompromisingly Protestant, and even Calvinist in tone'. In Newman's case the Articles might be read in 'the most Catholic sense they will admit'. Others might read them with a liberal agenda and with little regard for whether the Articles would admit that sense or not.

Subscription to the Articles as a means of preserving the doctrinal orthodoxy of the Church of England, even when this was legally enforced, did not and ultimately could not prevent dissembling and deviation. Faithful, orthodox belief has always been more than simply a form of words. It has always been possible, in the apostle Paul's words, to have 'the appearance of godliness' while 'denying its power' (2 Tim. 3:5). Far too many Anglican leaders have been willing to subscribe to the Articles and yet by their life and teaching to deny the Protestant and reformed character of them.

Of course this was not the only strategy for getting around the classic requirement to endorse the theology of the Articles. Amendments to the canon law of the Church of England in 1975 saw a new form of the oath of subscription which was deliberately more vague—

I, A B, do so affirm, and accordingly declare my belief in the faith which is revealed in the Holy Scriptures and set forth in the catholic creeds and to which the historic formularies of the Church of England bear witness...¹³

Debate continues as to whether this amendment finally achieves the more general assent to the theology of the Articles which some had been arguing was the only obligation upon English clergy.¹⁴

On the other side of the Atlantic, what began as the Protestant Episcopal Church and is now simply known as The Episcopal Church, has never required subscription to the Articles. Article VII of the Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church, enacted in 1787, prescribes a Declaration of Conformity and Belief that omits all reference to the Thirty-nine Articles.¹⁵ Examination for familiarity with ‘the text of the Book of Articles’ (an revised edition of the Thirty-nine Articles approved by the Convention of 1801) was required of all who were seeking ordination by virtue of a canon enacted by the Convention of 1871, but this was removed by the Convention of 1904.¹⁶ The American version of the Articles still appears in editions of the Book of Common Prayer, but in a special section at the back entitled ‘Historical Documents of the Church’.¹⁷

Subscription to the Articles in their original form was always going to be difficult for an independent United States of America. After all, Article 37 boldly proclaims that ‘The Queen’s Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and other her dominions ...’ This article in particular locates the Articles both historically and geographically. In the mid-sixteenth century Cranmer had to content himself with a doctrinal statement tailored to the particular needs of the English church. What would happen when the English version of reformed Protestantism was exported? This brings us to the final factor we must consider before returning to our original questions: the emergence of global Anglicanism.

The Articles in a new world: Global Anglicanism

Through a combination of the colonising activity of the British government in the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and the missionary commitment of certain members within the Church of England evident as early as the eighteenth century (the Church Missionary Society would be formed in 1799), English Protestantism has become a world phenomenon. Perhaps not surprisingly, there are now many times more active Anglicans in the rest of the world than nominal Anglicans in Britain.

Philip Jenkins has made his reputation writing about the emergence of the Global South as a Christian force to be reckoned with.¹⁸ He is speaking about more than simply the Anglican scene, of course. However, it has a particular relevance for Anglicans. Since 1867 Anglican bishops from all over the world

have gathered every ten years in England in what has become known as the Lambeth Conference. While the gathering continues to be dominated by bishops from England and North America, the numerical strength of the Anglican Communion has shifted decisively to south of the equator. The Episcopal Church in America claims around 2.4 million members.¹⁹ The Church of England website claims that 1.7 million people take part in a Church of England service each month, rising to 3 million on Christmas Eve or Christmas Day.²⁰ The Church of Canada claims just 800,000 members.²¹ In contrast, a news report from the Church of Nigeria in 2007 claimed over 18 million members,²² while the Church of Uganda is home to over 9 million,²³ the Church of Kenya over 5 million,²⁴ and the Church of Tanzania 4 million.²⁵ The list could go on but the picture is, I think, quite clear.

The growing strength of Anglicanism outside of Britain and America was recognised by the international structures of the denomination when the first of a series of South-to-South Encounters was planned for Limuru, Kenya in 1994.²⁶ Three years later, a second Encounter was held in Kuala Lumpur. Even at this stage it was clear that the distance between the North and the South was more than one of history and culture. A distinctive theological voice was emerging, one which challenged the liberalism long dominant in the American, Canadian and English provinces. By the time the third Encounter was held in Egypt in October 2005 that liberalism had produced not just a further series of heretical statements by Anglican bishops—denials of the uniqueness of Christ as Saviour,²⁷ of the penal substitutionary character of the atonement,²⁸ and of the bodily resurrection of Christ²⁹—but the consecration of a non-celibate homosexual man as the Bishop of New Hampshire in November 2003. It was this Third Encounter which produced the *Third Trumpet*, a landmark communiqué which included a reference to the Thirty-nine Articles:

We emerge from the Encounter strengthened to uphold the supreme authority of the Word of God and the doctrinal formularies that have undergirded the Anglican Communion for over four and a half centuries. Communion requires alignment with the will of God first and foremost, which establishes our commonality with one another. Such expressions of the will of God which Anglicans should hold in common are: one Lord, one faith, one baptism; Holy Scripture; apostolic teaching and practice; the historic Creeds of the Christian Church; the Articles of Religion and

the doctrinal tenets as contained in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. Holding truth and grace together by the power of the Holy Spirit, we go forward as those entrusted ‘with the faith once delivered’ (Jude 3).³⁰

As tension between the Americans (including Canada who voted to develop rites for same sex blessings in 2002) and the vast majority of the rest of the Anglican Communion continued to intensify over the next few years, the call for a return to the confessional basis of Anglicanism grew louder. When it became clear that the Archbishop of Canterbury would still invite the Americans and Canadians to Lambeth in 2008 (he did not invite the bishop of New Hampshire but he attended anyway), a group of the southern Primates gathered in Nairobi on their own initiative to consider their response. They decided to call their own conference just prior to Lambeth and to hold it in Jerusalem.

Prior to the conference, a group of theologians met twice at the invitation of these southern Primates to prepare the resources for the conference. One of the urgent questions they addressed was that of authority and Anglican identity. In the book that resulted, *The Way, the Truth and the Life*, once again the Thirty-nine Articles were considered a point of reference:

[Authentic Anglicanism] embraces the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion (published in the year 1571) and the Book of Common Prayer (the two versions of 1552 and 1662), both texts being read according to their plain and historical sense, and being accepted as faithful expressions of the teaching of Scripture, which provides the standard for Anglican theology and practice.³¹

GAFCON met in Jerusalem in June and after extensive consultation between the conference as a whole, the various provincial representatives, the theological resource group and the Primates and leadership team which had called the conference, the statement design group submitted the Jerusalem Declaration which was received with acclamation and signed on 29 June 2008. Clause 4 stated: ‘We uphold the Thirty-nine Articles as containing the true doctrine of the Church agreeing with God’s Word and as authoritative for Anglicans today.’³²

The seriousness of this appeal to the Articles is fleshed out by the recently

published commentary on the Jerusalem Declaration written by the movement's Theological Resource Group.

The Jerusalem Declaration calls the church back to the Articles as a faithful testimony to the teaching of Scripture, excluding erroneous beliefs and practices and giving a distinctive shape to Anglican Christianity.³³

What is most significant in all of these recent developments is that, despite very obvious political and cultural differences from contemporary England, let alone the England in which the Thirty-nine Articles first appeared, Anglicans in the Global South have still recognised in those Articles a litmus test for authentic Anglicanism. Indeed, in the theological discussions leading up to GAFCON, the only serious doubts about the confessional nature of authentic Anglicanism were raised by some American Episcopalians. Were they relevant outside of their original context? Didn't they contain elements, such as an endorsement of the authority of the British crown over the English church, which could not be accepted in other parts of the world? However, in response, Ashley Null, in a booklet published by the Global South Institute, made it clear that the reference to the English monarchy in the Articles need not require Anglicans outside of England to accept British rule. The Articles themselves expect local adaptation of structures and ceremonies while retaining the theological perspective which is given one legitimate form of expression in the Elizabethan settlement.

The Articles present no stumbling block to Anglican multi-culturalism. After all, it is the Articles themselves that assume a wide diversity in church practices, as each nation develops those rites and ceremonies appropriate for its own context. Yet, the Articles also insist on an underlying unity of Christian churches, and that this unity is none other than agreement on the essentials of salvation. Moreover the Articles also make clear that these essentials are found in only one place — Scripture understood in its plain sense and interpreted in the light of the entire canonical witness by the rule of non-contradiction.³⁴

Far from the Articles being rendered irrelevant by the rise of Global Anglicanism, the churches of the orthodox South are currently calling upon the churches of the North to take them seriously as a basis for a more meaningful unity within the denomination. If anything provides the contours for a genuine Anglican theology it is this confessional document with its insistent orientation

to the authority of God's word written. Authentic Anglicanism is not just an ethos. It is not simply a liturgical and ecclesiastical compromise. It has a definite theological shape and this finds expression in *The Thirty-nine Articles*.³⁵

Conclusion: The Benefits and Limitations of Confessionalism

Does the current crisis within Anglicanism represent a failure on the part of the Thirty-nine Articles? Has their inadequacy been demonstrated by officially sanctioned departures from their theology? Were they simply not robust enough to ensure an unambiguously faithful witness to Christ and his gospel within the Anglican churches four hundred and fifty years later? Was the practice of subscription flawed from the outset?

The difficulty has never been the Articles themselves. Despite the attempts of many through the centuries to deny it, the Articles are unambiguously Protestant and recognisably reformed. They locate the Church of England and its offspring throughout the world firmly within the tradition of the European Reformation and demonstrate the influence of Luther, Melancthon, Bucer, Bullinger and even Calvin. They are insistently biblical, claiming only a contingent authority for themselves and for those in leadership in the churches. They will not relinquish the claim to be teaching the faith once for all delivered. And they do this without being unduly prescriptive. They give room to breathe, room to differ on issues the Bible itself does not foreclose upon, room to grow in faith and our obedience to the word of God. They do not attempt to say everything, or even to settle every debate. Instead they give a definite shape to Anglican theology by speaking clearly of the centre, enshrining unrestricted and final authority to the word of God written, the sovereign grace of God by which we are saved through Christ's death and resurrection. They are most clearly documents of their time but from the beginning they were meant to last beyond that time.

If the Articles are flawed, they are flawed only in so much as they did not envisage their use outside of England. The English reformation began with a repudiation of the right of religious authorities in another land to determine the shape of faithful witness to Christ in England. Cranmer's dream of a united Reformed confession did materialise and England had produced her own. And yet the hints are there in the Articles themselves that local adaption of church

structures and practices is a good thing and in and of itself does not jeopardise a common theological perspective. Those few comments in the later articles which bear the stamp of English political realities are no barrier to what Ashley Null calls ‘Anglican multi-culturalism’.

But the real difficulty is that any confessional document can only do so much. The effectiveness of subscription relies upon integrity on the part of the one making the subscription, an integrity which involves fair dealing with the text of the Articles on their own terms. Departure from the theology of the Articles has not been the result of poor framing of this confession in the first place. Far too often it has arisen from commitment to another agenda, one directly at odds with the determined biblical orientation of the Articles themselves. Subscription to the Articles, even an insistence upon subscription to the Articles in the ‘literal and grammatical sense’ and ‘willingly and *ex animo*’, could not ensure theological faithfulness because in the end the law can only enforce external conformity. Genuine faithfulness, on the other hand, is the work of the Spirit.

The Thirty-nine Articles constitute one of the great Reformation confessions of the sixteenth century which enable authentic Anglicanism to be recognised today. They unmask the pretensions of those Anglican leaders who claim to be proclaiming the Christian gospel but have in fact manufactured another gospel of their own. Of course, enthusiastic endorsement of the theological perspective the Articles present must go hand in hand with a continued willingness to subject them to the scrutiny of Scripture again and again. Their authority must always be contingent in nature. Yet generations of faithful men and women have found in them a proper expression of biblical truth and an appropriate vehicle for a common confession.

The Revd. Dr. MARK D. THOMPSON is Head of Theology at Moore Theological College, Sydney, Australia.

ENDNOTES

1. B. Gordon, *Calvin* (New Haven: Yale), p. 79.
2. J. I. Packer, *A Guide to the 39 Articles Today* (London: Church Book Room, no date), p. 6.
3. ‘Mandate for Subscription to the Articles, 1552’, in G. E. Duffield (ed.), *The Work*

of *Thomas Cranmer* (Appleford: Sutton Courtenay, 1964), pp. 237–8.

4. H. Gee & W. J. Hardy (eds), *Documents Illustrative of English Church History* (New York: Macmillan, 1896), p. 479.
5. G. Bray (ed.), *The Anglican Canons 1529–1947* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998), pp. 197–99.
6. Bray, *Canons*, p. 219.
7. Bray, *Canons*, p. 321.
8. P. Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom with A History and Critical Notes* (3 vols; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1877), III, 487.
9. J. H. Newman, ‘Tract 90. Remarks on Certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles’ reprinted in *Tracts for the Times by Members of the University of Oxford* (London: Gilbert & Rivington 1834–1843), p. 80. Emphasis original and words in square brackets added in the corrections to the text in the second edition.
10. *Ibid.*
11. Newman, ‘Tract 90’, p. 82.
12. Newman, ‘Tract 90’, p. 81.
13. Canon C15 1. (1) printed in M. Hill, *Ecclesiastical Law* (3rd edn; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 343.
14. Packer, *Guide*, pp. 8–9.
15. E. A. White (ed.), *Constitution and Canons for the Government of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America* (New York: Gorham, 1924), pp. 85–86.
16. White, *Constitution*, pp. 224–225.
17. J. Pelikan & V. Hotchkiss (eds), *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition* 4 vols; (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), II, 527.
18. P. Jenkins, *The Next Christendom: the Coming of Global Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002); *The New Faces of Christianity: Believing the Bible in the Global South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006). Note should also be taken of what many regard as the landmark work in the field: L. Sanneh, *Whose Religion is Christianity?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).
19. <http://www.episcopalchurch.org/presiding-bishop.htm> (accessed 17 July 2009).
20. <http://www.cofe.anglican.org/about/thechurchofenglandtoday/> (accessed 17 July 2009).
21. <http://www.anglican.ca/about/index.htm> (accessed 17 July 2009).
22. <http://www.anglican-nig.org/enuguconsecration.htm> (accessed 17 July 2009).
23. <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1666693,00.html> (accessed 17 July 2009).

24. <http://www.ackeny.org/history.htm> (accessed 17 July 2009).
25. <http://www.anglican.or.tz/aboutACT.htm> (accessed 17 July 2009).
26. This Encounter was organized by the Anglican Consultative Council, acting upon a recommendation of the Brisbane 1986 Missions Conference. The resulting Global South movement has developed a degree of independence from the ACC.
27. Bishop Michael Ingham of New Westminster: 'It's time for Christians to drop the idea that Christ is the one sure way to salvation', *Ottawa Citizen* Sept. 26, 1997.
28. P. Carnley, "Theory of Atonement makes God look cruel," *Anglican Messenger*, July 1991, pp. 12–13. See also P. Carnley, 'King on a cross', *The Bulletin* 119/6270 (17 April 2001), pp. 32–35.
29. Bishop John Spong of Newark's 'Twelve Theses' includes this as number 7: 'Resurrection is an action of God, who raised Jesus into the meaning of God. It therefore cannot be a physical resuscitation occurring inside human history.' J. S. Spong, *Here I Stand: My Struggle for a Christianity of Integrity, Love, & Equality* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2000), p. 453. See also P. Carnley, 'The rising of the Son', *The Bulletin* 118/6221 (25 April 2000), pp. 40–43 and *Reflections in Glass: Trends and Tensions in the Contemporary Anglican Church* (Sydney: HarperCollins, 2004), pp. 115–128.
30. Third Anglican Global South to South Encounter, 'The Third Trumpet', §42. Online at www.globalsouthanglican.org/index.php/article/third_trumpet_communique_from_3rd_south_to_south_encounter/%22 (accessed 19 July 2009).
31. *The Way, the Truth and the Life: Theological Resources for a Pilgrimage to a Global Anglican Future* (London: Latimer Trust, 2008), p. 18.
32. <http://fca.net/dec.html> (accessed 19 July 2009).
33. *Being faithful. The shape of historic Anglicanism today* (London: Latimer Trust, 2009), p. 36.
34. Null, *The Thirty-Nine Articles*, p. 33. See also the commentary on clause 4 of the Jerusalem Declaration: 'Some of the Articles are intended as expressions of central biblical teaching held in common with other churches of the Reformation. While arising in the midst of sixteenth century debates about Christian doctrine, they remain critically important for the church today [...] Other Articles, however, are specific to the established English church and must be expressed differently in other contexts. The Articles do not address all the urgent issues of our day, but they do offer first principles and a framework for approaching the Bible which enable us to grapple with new questions and new challenges.'
35. This is even the case with the proposed Anglican Covenant, drawn up as part of 'the Windsor Process', an institutional response to the crisis which was published in

2004. The latest draft of the covenant, entitled *An Anglican Covenant: The Ridley Cambridge Draft*, includes the following, admittedly weak, reference to the Articles: The historic formularies of the Church of England, forged in the context of the European Reformation and acknowledged and appropriated in various ways in the Anglican Communion, bear authentic witness to this faith. §1.1.2 Ridley Cambridge Draft Text. Online at: <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/ridley_cambridge/draft_text.cfm> (accessed 20 July 2009).