

Marquette University

e-Publications@Marquette

Electrical and Computer Engineering Faculty Research and Publications/College of Engineering

This paper is NOT THE PUBLISHED VERSION; but the author's final, peer-reviewed manuscript. The published version may be accessed by following the link in the citation below.

Journal of Ecumenical Studies, Vol. 33, No. 4 (Fall 1996): 471-486. [Publisher link](#). This article is © University of Pennsylvania Press and permission has been granted for this version to appear in [e-Publications@Marquette](#). University of Pennsylvania Press does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from University of Pennsylvania Press.

THE CHICAGO-LAMBETH QUADRILATERAL: DEVELOPMENT IN AN ANGLICAN APPROACH TO CHRISTIAN UNITY

Robert B. Slocum

Theology, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI

PRECIS

The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral has served as the primary reference point and working document of the Anglican Communion for ecumenical Christian reunion. It identifies four essential elements for Christian unity in terms of scriptures, creeds, sacraments, and the Historic Episcopate. The Quadrilateral is based on the ecumenical thought and leadership of William Reed Huntington, an Episcopal priest who proposed the Quadrilateral in his book *The Church. Idea: In Essay toward Unity* (1870) and who was the moving force behind approval of the Quadrilateral by the House of Bishops of the 1886 General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church. It was subsequently approved with modifications by the Lambeth Conference of 1888 and finally reaffirmed in its Lambeth form by the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in 1895. The Quadrilateral has been at the heart of Anglican ecumenical discussions and relationships since its approval. Interpretation of the meaning of the Quadrilateral has undergone considerable development in its more than 100-year history. This

essay considers the unfolding and development of the Quadrilateral in terms of official church statements and the writings of other Anglican theologians. Particular attention is given to the meaning of the Historic Episcopate, which has required and received the most attention. Both the future ecumenical relationships of the churches of the Anglican Communion and the cause of church unity with respect to Anglicanism will hinge on the Quadrilateral as developed and applied.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral states the four Anglican essentials for a reunited Christian church. The statement was originally approved by the House of Bishops of the 1886 General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Chicago and subsequently approved by the Lambeth Conference of 1888 with modifications. The statement became the primary ecumenical working document of the Anglican Communion.

The Chicago version of the Quadrilateral offers an ecumenical statement of purpose and introduction that states that the Episcopal Church is "ready in the spirit of love and humility to forego all preferences of her own" concerning things of human ordering or choice "relating to modes of worship and discipline, or to traditional customs." The Episcopal Church "does not seek to absorb other Communion, but rather, co-operating with them on the basis of a common Faith and Order, to discountenance schism, to heal the wounds of the Body of Christ, and to promote the charity which is the chief of Christian graces and the visible manifestation of Christ to the world."¹ However, the statement of purpose warns, Christian unity ... can be restored only by the return of all Christian communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence; which principles we believe to be the substantial deposit of Christian Faith and Order committed by Christ and his Apostles to the Church unto the end of the world, and therefore incapable of compromise or surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards and trustees for the common and equal benefit of all men.²

The Chicago statement then lists the four "inherent parts of this sacred deposit," which are "essential" for the restoration of Christian unity:

- The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the revealed Word of God.
- The Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.
- The two Sacraments,--Baptism and the Supper of the Lord,--ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him.
- The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church.³

The Quadrilateral was not enacted by the House of Deputies at the 1886 General Convention in Chicago, but it was "incorporated in a general plan referred for study and action to a newly created Joint Commission on Christian Reunion."⁴ It was passed in a modified form as "Resolution II" of the Lambeth Conference of 1888. At Lambeth the four essential and "inherent parts" of the sacred deposit of the faith were termed "Articles." The introductory statement of purpose of the Chicago version of the Quadrilateral was deleted and replaced by a simple statement that "the following Articles supply a basis on which approach may be by God's blessing made towards Home Reunion."⁵

The Lambeth modifications include language from Article VI of the Articles of Religion that the scriptures of the First and Second Testaments contain "all things necessary to salvation." The Lambeth version also states that the scriptures provide "the rule and ultimate standard of faith." The Lambeth resolution affirms the Nicene Creed as the "sufficient statement of the Christian faith," but it also adds the "Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol" to the credal article of the Quadrilateral. The Lambeth version adds the statement that the dominical sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper were "ordained by Christ Himself." The article concerning the "Historic Episcopate" was not altered at Lambeth.⁶ Gillian R. Evans has noted that "the bishops of 1888 saw their `articles' as serving their ecumenical purpose best by saying the minimum, so as to be 'free from all questions of doubtful controversy' and thus acceptable as widely as possible."⁷

The Chicago version of the Quadrilateral continued for some time to be the "official" basis for ecumenical activity by the Episcopal Church. The Episcopal Church's Commission on Christian Unity was continued by resolutions at the 1889 and 1892 General Conventions, which authorized the Commission "to confer with all or any similar commissions for the restoration of the unity of the Church on the basis of those things declared essential elements of such basis [for reunion] by the House of Bishops" at the Chicago General Convention of 1886. Finally, in 1895, the Commission on Christian Unity was continued with the goal of seeking Christian unity on the basis of the "principles enunciated throughout the Declaration of the House of Bishops made at Chicago in 1886, and as re-affirmed by the Lambeth Conference of 1888."⁹ Thus, for the first time, in 1895, the entire General Convention of the Episcopal Church affirmed and owned the Quadrilateral in the form in which it had been finalized at Lambeth in 1888.

DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES AND AGENDAS CONCERNING THE QUADRILATERAL

The fact of an official statement of principles for ecumenical Christian reunion in any form was a major first step for the churches of the Anglican Communion. However, there have been different understandings of the nature and purpose of the Quadrilateral from its inception. John Woolverton noted, in his 1984 article on the Quadrilateral and the Lambeth Conference reactions to the Quadrilateral in its first century:

Behind the constant reiterations of the four points has been a debate about whether the Quadrilateral was a terminus ad quem, that is a conclusion to which unity talks should proceed or whether it was a terminus a quo, an agreement to be reached before we would commence to talk about unity with others and from which greater demands for agreement and conformity would naturally follow.¹⁰

Different goals and purposes for the Quadrilateral can be seen in the Chicago General Convention of 1886 and the Lambeth Conference of 1888. The Quadrilateral was first proposed by William Reed Huntington (1838-1909), an Episcopal priest, scholar, and leader of the House of Deputies. Prior to the Chicago General Convention, he proposed the Quadrilateral in his 1870 book, *The Church-Idea: An Essay towards Unity*.¹¹

Huntington wanted "to make Anglicanism the basis of a Church of the Reconciliation," but he felt it was "necessary to determine what Anglicanism pure and simple is." In this regard, he recognized a sharp distinction between Anglicanism and the current practice of the Church of England. Huntington noted that Anglicanism must be stripped of "the picturesque costume which English life has thrown around

it." In contrast, he concluded that the true Anglican position lies "foursquare" on the Holy Scriptures "as the Word of God," the "Primitive Creeds as the Rule of Faith," the "two Sacraments ordained by Christ himself," and the "Episcopate as the key-stone of Governmental Unity." Huntington blamed the "English State-Church" for having "muffled these first principles in a cloud of non-essentials," causing "the loss of half her children." In view of the English muddle of Anglicanism, he asked, rhetorically, "what if it can be shown that here in America we have an opportunity to give that [Anglican] principle the only fair trial it has ever had?"¹²

Huntington's purpose was neither confessional nor limited to a particular ethnic heritage. Woolverton noted that Huntington wanted his four "points" to provide the basis to "draw attention to those essentials around which all churches might eventually unite"; to "overcome the high church/low church divisions in the Anglican communion" by a return to the fundamentals without "insisting upon any interpretation of scripture, creeds, sacraments, and above all episcopal"; and to "persuade his own Episcopal church to become for America the Church of the Reconciliation."¹³

Huntington was anything but confessional in his approach. J. Robert Wright has noted that Huntington believed American national church unification "was to be accomplished on the basis of the Quadrilateral's four points rather than upon the time-honored quasi-confessional Anglican doctrinal basis of the Thirty-Nine Articles."¹⁴ Huntington urged in *The Church-Idea* that the articles should "not continue to be considered... one of the essentials of the Anglican position." He was also willing to dispense with the Anglican Prayer Book tradition of uniformity in worship.¹⁵

At the 1907 General Convention, Huntington's efforts to remove the Thirty-Nine Articles from the Episcopal Book of Common Prayer and to write the Quadrilateral into the preamble of the Episcopal Church Constitution were unsuccessful.¹⁶ Nevertheless, he definitely influenced the understanding of the Quadrilateral at the Chicago General Convention in 1886. Evans noted that the bishops at the Chicago Convention were concerned with reunion "of a diversity of Christian communions in their own land, rather than with the communion of Anglican churches scattered throughout the world. They addressed themselves 'especially to our fellow-Christians of the different Communion in this land.' They spoke of a 'Christian unity' of 'all Christian communions.'"¹⁷ The bishops at Chicago followed Huntington's lead.

The bishops at the Lambeth Conference of 1888, however, saw the Quadrilateral as the basis for "Home Reunion" of English-speaking peoples of various Christian faiths throughout the world. Henry Chadwick has noted, "By Home Reunion the English bishops meant the reconciliation of Protestant Nonconformists to the ministry and liturgy of the Church of England, or, in other words, the old ideal of a 'national' church with essential marks of Catholic continuity but including all Christians in one Christian nation in allegiance to the Crown."¹⁸ To achieve this goal of an English-speaking Home Reunion, Chadwick explained, "The Quadrilateral stated minimum conditions for establishing even partial and imperfect communion, and stripped things down to that skeletal structure which perhaps a moderate Nonconformist might think possible as a basis for discussion."¹⁹

Similarly, Evans noted that the bishops at Lambeth had an "ecumenical intention," but we need to be clear about the way they saw it. The Quadrilateral was a statement of the foundation principles of an Anglican church... in a British Empire which still confidently embraced much of the world and where it

was possible to talk of "Home Reunion," that is, to put first the practical need to hold together Anglican churches in widely differing conditions all over the world.²⁰

The goals of the Lambeth Conference for the Quadrilateral were an imperial and ethnic unity of English-speaking Christians, while the Chicago General Convention sought a national unity of all Christians. From the beginning, there were differing hopes and goals for the Quadrilateral.

DEVELOPMENT AND UNFOLDING OF THE QUADRILATERAL: ANGLICAN AND EPISCOPAL STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE " HISTORIC EPISCOPATE"

There was a "growing" understanding of the meaning and application of the Quadrilateral in the years that followed its framing. Evans noted that, when the framers of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral offered the four articles as a contribution to ecumenical understanding, they "fed them into a process in which they must undergo change and development in expression in order the better to state the central truths they sought to encapsulate."²¹ This process of development is most evident concerning the "Historic Episcopate."

The Quadrilateral's article on the episcopate certainly needed development. Arthur Vogel, a bishop in the Episcopal Church, has noted that the "Historic Episcopate" is "the most disputed element of the Quadrilateral" and that "The terse statement of the Quadrilateral's on the 'Historic Episcopate' has caused such a large volume of discussion because the concept was not defined, and because the idea of being able locally to adopt the episcopate to varying situations offered no limit to the adaptations and variations which might be produced."²²

Evans explained that the lack of doctrinal definition for the fourth article on episcopacy was intentional on the part of the drafters of the Quadrilateral. She noted that "Dr. Vincent, assistant bishop of Southern Ohio, was anxious in the debates of the 1880s to make it plain that the phrase 'the historic episcopate' was chosen precisely because it was intended to avoid saying anything 'of a doctrinal nature.'"²³ Vincent recalled, "That phrase "the Historic Episcopate" was deliberately chosen as declaring not a doctrine, but a fact, and as being general enough to include all variants."²⁴

An ecumenical statement that is "general enough to include all variants" also may cause problems. The variants need to be worked through to some degree of clarity and consensus before the statement can be the basis for significant ecumenical results. In terms of the need for development and clarification of the fourth article, Vogel noted:

When commentaries on the Quadrilateral are compared, however, the first feature to strike the attentive reader may be how much more explication the fourth principle seems to require than the other three. In the "Statement of Faith and Order" passed by the Episcopal Church's General Convention of 1949, over five times as much space is spent on the "Historic Episcopate" as is spent on any of the other three principles.²⁵

The rather terse and "matter of fact" article on the episcopate needed development.

The ecclesiological "climate" in the Anglican Communion was conducive for further reflection on episcopacy in the years following publication of the Quadrilateral. Chadwick noted:

The prominence of concern for the Old Catholics at the [Lambeth] conference of 1897 may evidently reflect a deeper realisation of the truth that Anglican ecumenism could not hope for much success if it were constructed on the basis of liberal Protestant ecclesiology; and the committee of the 1908 conference roundly declared "there can be no fulfillment of the Divine purpose in any scheme of reunion which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West, with which our history has been so closely associated in the past, and to which we are still bound by many ties of common faith and tradition."²⁶

Admittedly, the prospects for ecumenical relationship with "the great Latin Church of the West" were limited at this time due to the Roman Catholic view of the invalidity of Anglican orders.²⁷ Nevertheless, the prominent concern for the Old Catholics and the Roman Catholics stated implicitly the importance of episcopacy for future Anglican ecumenical discussions.

Reflection and comment on the episcopate became very explicit in the years following World War I with the "Appeal to All Christian People" of the 1920 Lambeth Conference. The Appeal restated the Quadrilateral's four points without mentioning the Quadrilateral by name.²⁸ Although the Appeal acknowledged "the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communion which do not possess the Episcopate," it urged, "We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of... A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body." The Appeal then asked, "May we not reasonably claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry?" That claim was supported by the statement that "... we submit that considerations alike of history and of present experience justify the claim which we make on behalf of the Episcopate. Moreover, we would urge that it is now and will prove to be in the future the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church."²⁹

The purpose of the Appeal's claim concerning the episcopacy was clearly ecumenical. The Appeal concluded that

we eagerly look forward to the day when through its acceptance in a united Church we may all share in that grace which is pledged to the members of the whole body in the apostolic rite of the laying-on of hands, and in the joy and fellowship of a Eucharist in which as one Family we may together, without any doubtfulness of mind, offer to the one Lord our worship and service.³⁰

The Appeal of the 1920 Lambeth Conference reflected considerable development concerning the role of episcopacy in Anglican ecumenical activity.

This development concerning Anglican episcopacy in an ecumenical context was continued in 1923 at a Lambeth Palace joint conference of Nonconformist divines and representatives of the Church of England. Although the Church of England representatives refused to declare nonepiscopal ministries to be "invalid," they regarded the preface to the ordinal of 1662 as more than "a local rule of discipline for the Church of England." The ordinal was seen "as enshrining a principle of order that Anglicans could not break without painful consequences both for relations with Rome and orthodoxy and for the internal coherence of the Anglican Communion."³¹

Chadwick noted that the Church of England representatives at the 1923 joint conference "envisaged the real possibility of an internal Anglican schism if the ordinal's requirement of episcopal ordination were to be set aside or made optional." In a statement that recalls the Quadrilateral, Chadwick concluded that the 1923 text "is a significant expression of the view that the Anglican Communion does not possess freedom to treat essential matters of order with any more liberty than could be applied to the doctrines of the creed or the use of the two sacraments of the gospel and the Bible."³²

Continuing development concerning the episcopate was evident in the Lambeth Report of 1930, which stated, "The Historical Episcopate as we understand it goes behind the perversions of history to the original conception of the Apostolic Ministry."³³ Woolverton noted that significant parts of the 1930 Lambeth Report were "reiterated and enlarged upon" by the "Statement of Faith and Order" from the Report of the Joint Commission on Approaches to Unity to the 1949 General Convention of the Episcopal Church. The 1949 Statement of Faith and Order quotes the appeal to patristic tradition of the 1930 Lambeth Report concerning episcopacy:

Whatever variety of system may have existed in addition in the earlier age, it is universally agreed that by the end of the second century episcopacy had no effective rival. Among all the controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries the episcopal ministry was never a subject of dispute If the Episcopate, as we find it established universally by the end of the second century, was the result of a process of adaptation and growth in the organism of the Church, that would be no evidence that it lacked divine authority, but rather that the life of the Spirit within the Church had found it to be the most appropriate organ for the functions which it discharged.³⁵

Appealing to Second Testament tradition to defend and define the role of ordained ministry in the church, the 1949 statement considered the Historic Episcopate in light of the mutuality of ministerial service and responsibility in the church of the Second Testament:

The Church is set before us in the New Testament as a body of believers having within it, as its recognized focus of unity, of teaching and of authority, the Apostolate, which owed its origin to the action of the Lord Himself. There was not first an Apostolate which gathered a body of believers about itself; nor was there a completely structureless collection of believers which gave authority to the Apostles to speak and act on its behalf. From the first there was the fellowship of believers finding its unity in the Twelve. Thus the New Testament bears witness to the principle of a distinctive ministry, as an original element, but not the sole constitutive element, in the life of the Church?

The 1949 statement noted that Anglican formularies define "ministers within this historic stream as 'Ministers of Apostolic Succession.'" Although no judgments were made concerning other ministries, Woolverton concluded, this statement meant that for Anglicans "the theory of apostolic succession could not be excluded."³⁷

The statement expanded the meaning of the Quadrilateral's "Historic Episcopate" to specify the apostolicity of the threefold ordained ministry in the church. "It should be clear," the statement urged, that while acceptance of the "Historic Episcopate" may not involve acceptance of any one formulation of the doctrine of the ministry, it does involve acceptance, in the form of a fact, of the three-fold

ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons, and the acceptance of it also as accompanied by the claim that it is a ministerial succession tracing back to the "Apostles' time."³⁸

Evans found the 1949 statement to be an exposition that "moves away from the extreme simplicity of the Chicago-Lambeth formulations." It contrasts with the language and emphasis of the Quadrilateral. The statement "places the emphasis upon 'response' and 'reception' and the reciprocal movement of God's self-revelation and Christian understanding. It reflects the attitudes of a less authoritarian age, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say, of an age when Christian authority was beginning to be understood rather differently."³⁹ Evans's conclusion about authority seems directly related to the statement's discussion of mutuality of ministries and authority concerning the Historic Episcopate. The 1949 statement reflected a considerable development concerning episcopacy in Anglican ecclesiology and ecumenical activity.

Further development concerning the Quadrilateral and episcopacy was evident at the 1982 General Convention in New Orleans. The 1982 resolution considered the Quadrilateral both in terms of Anglican identity and ecumenical relations. The 1982 text reaffirmed the Quadrilateral "as a statement of basic principles which express our own unity, and as a statement of essential principles for organic unity with other churches."⁴⁰

The 1982 text also presents "an explication of that basic document" of the Quadrilateral, including a developed view of episcopacy in light of the full meaning of apostolicity. The text considers the "Historic Episcopate" in light of the ministries of all baptized persons in the church, while also taking into account the church's scriptural and traditional sources of authority. The text states:

Apostolicity is evidenced in continuity with the teaching, the ministry, and the mission of the apostles. Apostolic teaching must, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, be founded upon the Holy Scriptures and the ancient fathers and creeds, making its proclamation of Jesus Christ and his Gospel for each new age consistent with those sources, not merely reproducing them in a transmission of verbal identity. Apostolic ministry exists to promote, safeguard and serve apostolic teaching. All Christians are called to this ministry by their Baptism. In order to serve, lead and enable this ministry, some are set apart and ordained in the historic orders of Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon. We understand the Historic Episcopate as central to this apostolic ministry and essential to the reunion of the Church.⁴¹

The explication also identifies the role of episcopacy in the continuity of the church's mission through time. The text explains this role in functional terms, noting:

Apostolic mission is itself a succession of apostolic teaching and ministry inherited from the past and carried into the present and future. Bishops in apostolic succession are, therefore, the focus and personal symbols of this inheritance and mission as they preach and teach the Gospel and summon the people of God to their mission of worship and service.⁴²

However, it is important to note that the 1982 statement recognizes the apostolic ministry to be larger than the Historic Episcopate. All Christians are understood to share in the apostolic ministry of the church by baptism. As stated in the 1949 statement, the ministry of the apostles was distinctive and an original element, but not "the sole constitutive element" in the life of the church. James E. Griffiss has described the distinction between apostolic ministry and Historic Episcopate as a "most significant"

development in the official statements and other theological writings of the Anglican Communion concerning ecumenical relations. In view of this distinction, he urged, "Now it was possible to say more clearly that apostolic ministry is the fundamental ministry which derives from Christ himself as the High Priest who reconciles the world to God through his life, death and resurrection."⁴³

The 1982 statement reflects considerable development of the original Quadrilateral concerning the Historic Episcopate, especially with respect to apostolic continuity and the interdependence of the ministries of all baptized persons in the church. Margaret O'Gara, in a Roman Catholic response to Wright's centenary essay, "Heritage and Vision," noted the "increasing sophistication or nuanced distinctions which the Quadrilateral elicited within the Anglican Communion and within the American Episcopal church during its one hundred years especially in the Quadrilateral's fourth point, the point that emphasizes the importance of the episcopate within the work of reunion of the church."⁴⁴

Regarding the relationship of apostolic teaching, ministry, and mission relative to apostolic continuity in the 1982 statement, O'Gara concluded:

This understanding of the episcopate within the context of apostolicity is not seen as any less a conviction of the importance of the episcopate: indeed, in 1982 the episcopate is called "essential" for reunion. But the reason for its essential character is explained more carefully, with more nuances. It is a long way from the simple lists that included the episcopate in 1886 and 1888.⁴⁵

The meaning of the "Historic Episcopate" has undergone considerable development since the framing of the Quadrilateral, as evidenced by the subsequent statements of the Anglican Communion and the Episcopal Church.

DEVELOPMENT AND UNFOLDING OF THE QUADRILATERAL: REFLECTIONS CONCERNING THE "HISTORIC EPISCOPATE" BY ANGLICAN THEOLOGIAN

The Quadrilateral has been considered by other Anglican theologians whose writings reflect the development of the "Historic Episcopate" in Anglican thought, identity, and ecumenical activity. This development is considered in a sampling of theological themes presented by Charles P. Price, Arthur A. Vogel, and John Macquarrie concerning the Quadrilateral.

Price has emphasized the role of the episcopate in the dynamic process of maintaining apostolic continuity between the past, present, and future of the church's life. He used a literary analogy to explain the problem of continuity in the church: "The Red Queen in Alice Through the Looking Glass said that in her race, you had to run as fast as you could to stay in the same place." Similarly, Price urged, "In our Christian race, theology has to change precisely in order to communicate the same message." In this regard, the "Historic Episcopate" serves to "regulate and supervise the change, so that it does not alter beyond recognition."⁴⁶

The flexibility needed for this ministry of "regulating and supervising" theological change is available in the "Historic Episcopate," which is distinctive among the points of the Quadrilateral. Price explained that the episcopate "operates quite differently from the other three Lambeth items. It involves a human factor, which is its virtue and strength on the one hand and its peril and risk on the other. It accounts for continuity through time and change in the transmission of the apostolic message."⁴⁷ Price

has clearly identified the dynamic role of the "Historic Episcopate" in the apostolic continuity of the church.

Price's insight concerning apostolic continuity resembles that of the 1982 text, with one limitation. Price did not situate the episcopate's role concerning apostolic continuity in the context of the apostolicity of the entire church and the ministries of all baptized members. Although the episcopate's responsibility for "regulating and supervising" theological change is not seriously disputed, this apostolic ministry should be placed in the context of the apostolic life, ministry, mission, and theological reflection of the whole church. Theologically speaking, the episcopate speaks on behalf of the whole apostolic community to insure the apostolic continuity of the church in and through the process of theological change. Practically speaking, it is advisable for the episcopate to have the full benefit of the experience and theological reflection of the whole church before attempting to say anything to preserve apostolic continuity. Nevertheless, Price has offered an important insight concerning the role of the "Historic Episcopate" in theological change and apostolic continuity.

Vogel described the meaning of the "Historic Episcopate" in incarnational terms, urging that "[t]he key word is 'historic.' The 'Historic Episcopate' is another mark of God's having truly entered history; it is another way in which God's mystery is confronted in the human world." He explained that the "historic" of "Historic Episcopate" reflects God's gift and indicates God's action in history.⁴⁸ Showing appreciation for the role and context of episcopacy in community, Vogel has emphasized the episcopacy's calling for service in the community rather than lordship over others. He urged that "The church is a community of service, not a society of rulers and ruled. Because the spirit of the one who came to serve rather than to be served fills the Christian community of faith, there is no need for the presence of Christ, the Head of the Church, to be passed from one person to another in a delegated manner."⁴⁹ However, the apostolic ministry does serve to signify Christ's ubiquitous risen presence to the community.

The "Historic Episcopate," with other ministerial orders, also identifies "special servants of the church to the church." The episcopacy may then be understood in terms of ordination that focuses and unites the whole church's vocation to service. Vogel explained that the Historic Episcopate is a focus for the unity of the Christian community, "but, if the nature of the episcopate is fully understood, it focusses a oneness of service, not lordship, through time and space."⁵⁰ In this regard, the themes of Vogel's theology prove to be deeply interconnected, as the Historic Episcopate "reveals the mystical body's nature to itself in a sacramental manner: the ordained ministry, as an apostolic ministry, points beyond itself both to God and to the nature of God's people."⁵¹

Vogel's essay leads to important conclusions that reflect significant development of thought concerning the Historic Episcopate. The episcopate is "incarnational" and sacramental. It signifies for the community in time and space the source of the community's life in Christ. It also represents the nature of the community's vocation and identity in service. In this way, the episcopate /s the focus of unity for the church. It is also the focus for drawing together and enabling the diverse ministries of the baptized who share the church's apostolic mission. In this way, the apostolicity of the community is continued.

Macquarrie has understood the four "notes" of the church (one, holy, catholic, apostolic) to be signified or embodied in terms of the four points of the Quadrilateral: The church's unity is signified

and embodied by the Bible, and the church's holiness is visibly embodied by its sacramental life (with special respect and reverence given to "the forms which are rooted in the Bible and which have been developed in the Church's tradition and proved of value in her devotional life).⁵² The church's catholicity is embodied in "the catholic creeds, especially the Apostles' and Nicene; and also the pronouncements of the universally recognized councils of the Church, such as those of Nicaea and Chalcedon,"⁵³ and the church's apostolicity is embodied in the episcopacy.

Macquarrie explained, "The apostolic Church is the authentic Church, continuing the teaching and practice of the apostles, who had been 'eyewitnesses' of the events proclaimed in the Church's message" and who were "commissioned by Christ himself."⁵⁴ Macquarrie (like Price) has understood the church's apostolicity in terms of continuity through time. Although the church must change "in many ways," Macquarrie urged that "it can claim to be the Church of Jesus Christ only if it has retained at least a minimal degree of continuity with Christ, first through his apostles and then through the generations of their successors."⁵⁵ The inner meaning of the church's apostolicity is its "constancy in the faith of the apostles," which the episcopacy protects by "ensuring the continuity of that heritage of faith and practice which was likewise transmitted by the apostles."⁵⁶

Macquarrie's identification of the four notes of the church with the Quadrilateral has not gone unchallenged.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, his discussion of the episcopate's role in maintaining continuity reflects a developed theological understanding of the Quadrilateral's fourth article. The theological reflections of Price, Vogel, and Macquarrie on the Historic Episcopate demonstrate considerable development from the "simple lists" of the Quadrilateral.

CONCLUSION: THE QUADRILATERAL'S CONTINUING ECUMENICAL USEFULNESS AND DEVELOPMENT

The Quadrilateral remains the standard for Anglican ecumenical relations. Its continuing importance is evidenced by Peter Day in a letter written to the members of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations and the Episcopal members of the Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue on January 25, 1973, when he was Ecumenical Officer of the Episcopal Church. In responding to a report of recent Lutheran-Episcopal conversations, Day wrote, "Perhaps the most controversial issue for Episcopalians is whether the degree of recognition accorded to non-episcopal Lutheran ordinations and Eucharistic celebrations is within the meaning of Point IV of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral."⁵⁸

The Quadrilateral continues to be the Anglican foundation for ecumenical relations. Wright noted that "Every General Convention from 1934 to 1964 instructed the Episcopal Church's Joint Commission on Approaches to Unity to conduct its ecumenical conversations 'on the basis of the Chicago Lambeth Quadrilateral.'"⁵⁹ He explained that

every time a proposal has come from some unofficial group, from some official commission, or from elsewhere in the Episcopal Church to replace the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, or to alter its fourth point in the light of apparently more recent scholarly and ecumenical realities, the General Convention has always demurred and returned to a reaffirmation of the Quadrilateral in its 1888 form as the starting point and basis for discussion, thus establishing it as the binding standard for the Episcopal Church's participation in the ecumenical movement. This is the authority that it still seems to hold.⁶⁰

Macquarrie likewise concluded that the Quadrilateral "still remains the basic minimum required for any possible reunion."⁶¹

Interpretation of the Quadrilateral's meaning also continues to develop as it is used in ecumenical contexts. For example, it has been noted with reference to the Historic Episcopate in recent ecumenical discussions of the Episcopal Church with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America⁶² and with the Orthodox Church in Russia. At the 1992 Moscow Consultation of the Joint Coordinating Committee of the Episcopal Church and the Orthodox Church in Russia, Richard A. Norris of the Episcopal Church appealed to the Quadrilateral in his paper on "Bishops, Succession, and the Apostolicity of The Church."⁶³ In summary, he suggested that

the apostolicity of the church's life and its unity with its own origins does not consist merely or solely in the succession of bishops but in the organic continuity of a 'concatenated set of institutions'-Scriptures, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, the two Gospel Sacraments, and Historic Episcopate which support each other and are mutually interrelated.⁶⁴

Norris's use of the Quadrilateral reflects its vitality and ongoing development in ecumenical dialogue.

We may hope that the application of the Quadrilateral will continue in its process of development and evolution. Its principles should be much more than a "litmus test" or minimum requirement for ecumenical relationships. Vogel stated that the principles of the Quadrilateral should "call us beyond ourselves." When they are seen as "marks of God's presence in and presence to the church," Vogel concluded, "the principles of the Quadrilateral immediately move us into the mystery of our salvation and reveal the structure of our most intimate life with God. They are not just tests one community can give to another to see whether they may both be called by the same name."⁶⁵ This understanding reflects development concerning the meaning and appropriate use of the Quadrilateral. As such development continues, the Quadrilateral can continue to be the Anglican instrument for deepening, clarifying, articulating, and sharing with others "our most intimate life with God."

NOTES

[1]"Text of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral," in J. Robert Wright, ed., *Quadrilateral at One Hundred, Essays on the Centenary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, 1886/88-1986/88*, Anglican Theological Review Supplemental Series 10 (March, 1988) (Cincinnati, OH: Forward Movement Publications, 1988), p. vii. Wright's significant collection of essays on the Quadrilateral serves as a major source for this study.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid., p. viii.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid., pp. viii-ix.

[7]Gillian R. Evans, "'Permanence in the Revealed Truth and Continuous Exploration of Its Meaning,'" in Wright, *Quadrilateral at One Hundred*, p. 112.

[8]J. Robert Wright, "Heritage and Vision: The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral," in Wright, *Quadrilateral at One Hundred*, pp. 29-30.

[9]Ibid., p. 30.

- [10]John F. Woolverton, "The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral and the Lambeth Conferences," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 53 (June, 1984): 101. Woolverton urged that "Anglo-catholic Anglicans have traditionally opted" for the terminus a quo position.
- [11]Wright, "Heritage and Vision," pp. 8-9. Huntington's first proposal of the Quadrilateral may have been at ecumenical clergy gatherings in Worcester, Massachusetts, in the 1860's. He co-founded this ecumenical clergy fellowship with a priest from St. Paul's Roman Catholic parish in Worcester while serving as rector of All Saints Church, Worcester. Woolverton noted that the term "Quadrilateral" for Huntington's "four-sided ecclesiological figure" was borrowed "from the system of fortress cities in Lombardy comprised of Mantua, Verona, Peschiera, and Legano which figured in the Napoleonic wars and which, from 1815 to 1859, provided Austria with a means of keeping northern Italy under her control" (Woolverton, "The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral," p. 98).
- [12]Wright, "Heritage and Vision," pp. 9-10, quoting Huntington's *The Church-Idea: An Essay towards Unity* (1870), pp. 155-157.
- [13]Woolverton, "The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral," p. 98.
- [14]Wright, "Heritage and Vision," p. 12; emphasis in original.
- [15]Ibid.
- [16]Ibid. Ironically, the Quadrilateral now follows the Articles of Religion in the "Historical Documents" section at the back of the Book of Common Prayer of the Episcopal Church.
- [17]Evans, "Permanence," p. 112.
- [18]Henry Chadwick, "The Quadrilateral in England," in Wright, *Quadrilateral at One Hundred*, p. 140.
- [19]Ibid., p. 141.
- [20]Evans, "Permanence," pp. 111-112.
- [21]Ibid., p. 125; emphasis in original.
- [22]Arthur A. Vogel, "Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral: Yardstick or Mirror?" in Wright, *Quadrilateral at One Hundred*, pp. 136-137. Vogel served as Bishop of West Missouri.
- [23]Evans, "Permanence," p. 118.
- [24]Ibid., pp. 118-119.
- [25]Vogel, "Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral," p. 136.
- [26]Chadwick, "Quadrilateral in England," p. 146.
- [27]Ibid., pp. 146-147.
- [28]Wright, "Heritage and Vision," p. 26.
- [29]Ibid.
- [30]Ibid.
- [31]Chadwick, "Quadrilateral in England," p. 149.
- [32]Ibid.
- [33]John F. Woolverton, "Huntington's Quadrilateral--A Critical Study," *Church History* 39 (June, 1970): 199. Woolverton commented dryly that this statement was made "with something less than historical acuity."
- [34]Ibid.
- [35]Wright, "Heritage and Vision," p. 35.
- [36]Ibid., p. 34.
- [37]Woolverton, "Huntington's Quadrilateral," p. 199.
- [38]Wright, "Heritage and Vision," p. 34.

- [39]Evans, "Permanence," p. 116. Evans noted, "If we put the 1949 statement and the report of ARCIC I on authority side by side with the formulations of 1886-88 it is obvious at once that the tone of the 1949 statement is much closer to ARCIC than to the Quadrilateral" (ibid.).
- [40]Wright, "Heritage and Vision," p. 41.
- [41]Ibid., p. 42. This statement concerning apostolicity and apostolic ministry is virtually identical to an earlier unofficial statement on principles of unity. James E. Griffiss noted that in 1978 the Episcopal Church began "a major theological evaluation" of its ecumenical conversations. The theologians and ecumenical consultants involved in the evaluation wanted "to state once again on what basis the Episcopal Church, as a province of the Anglican Communion, could reach doctrinal consensus with other traditions," and felt that the Quadrilateral "needed elaboration and development in consideration of the new issues which have arisen" since it was proposed (James E. Griffiss, *Church, Ministry, and Unity: A Divine Commission* [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983], pp. 91-93). This unofficial statement on principles of unity was published as "The Detroit Report: National Ecumenical Consultation of the Episcopal Church, Farmington Hills, Michigan (Detroit), 5-9 November 1978," in J. Robert Wright, ed., *A Communion of Communion: One Eucharistic Fellowship- The Detroit Report and Papers of the Triennial Ecumenical Study of the Episcopal Church, 1976-1979*, A Crossroad Book (New York: Seabury Press, 1979), pp. 1-29, with the proposed "principles for unity with other churches" on pp. 16-17.
- [42]Wright, *Heritage and Vision*, p. 42.
- [43]Griffiss, *Church, Ministry, and Unity*, p. 56. He quotes the 1949 statement on pp. 56-57.
- [44]Margaret O'Gara, "The Episcopate, the Universal Primacy, and the Growth of Understanding: A Roman Catholic Response to Robert Wright," in Wright, *Quadrilateral at One Hundred*, p. 48.
- [45]Ibid., p. 49.
- [46]Charles P. Price, "Whence, Whither, and What? Reflections on the Hundredth Anniversary," in Wright, *Quadrilateral at One Hundred*, p. 92.
- [47]Ibid., p. 93.
- [48]Vogel, "Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral," p. 137.
- [49]Ibid., p. 138.
- [50]Ibid., p. 139.
- [51]Ibid., p. 138.
- [52]John Macquarrie, *Principles of Christian Theology*, 2nd ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1977), p. 407; see, generally, pp. 401-413.
- [53]Ibid., p. 407.
- [54]Ibid., p. 409.
- [55]Ibid., p. 410.
- [56]Ibid.
- [57]See Price, "Whence, Whither, and What?" pp. 86-87. Price disagreed with Macquarrie, stating, "One recognizes something artificial and mechanical about this direct one-to-one identification between the several Lambeth articles and the several notes of the church --which are as old as the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed itself" (ibid., p. 87).
- [58]Don S. Armentrout, "Lutheran-Episcopal Conversations in the Nineteenth Century," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 44 (June, 1975): 186-187.
- [59]Wright, "Heritage and Vision," p. 39.

[60]Ibid., pp. 42-43.

[61]Macquarrie, Principles, p. 412.

[62]William A. Norgren and William G. Rusch, eds., "Toward Full Communion" and "Concordat of Agreement," Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue, Series III (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing Co.; Cincinnati, OH: Forward Movement Publications, 1991), pp. 65-68 (paras. 3-65). This statement also quoted the rewording of the Quadrilateral by the bishops of the 1920 Lambeth Conference in "An Appeal to All Christian People" and considered the "deliberate but steady" responses to this Appeal.

[63]Richard A. Norris, Jr., "Bishops, Succession, and the Apostolicity of the Church [Third Paper]," in J. Robert Wright, ed., *On Being a Bishop: Papers on Episcopacy from the Moscow Consultation, 1992* (New York: Church Hymnal Corporation, 1993), pp. 59-62. Papers on episcopacy for the Moscow Consultation of June 22-27, 1992, of the Joint Coordinating Committee for practical cooperation and bilateral relations between the Episcopal Church and the Orthodox Church in Russia were published in *On Being a Bishop*.

[64]"Joint Working Document: Summary of the Moscow Papers and Review of the Discussions [III. The Rev. Canon Prof. Richard A. Norris-'Bishops, Succession, and the Apostolicity of the Church']," in Wright, *On Being a Bishop*, pp. 217-218.

[65]Vogel, "Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral," p. 128.