



SEPTEMBER 2021

The Society for Ecumenical Studies

Newsletter 14



A Letter from the Editor - 1

**Church and State in Wales: a holy or
an unholy alliance? -4**

**Papers from the Church – State
relations seminar held 16 June - 7**

**Presbyterianism, from Patronage
to Percy: Church and State in
Scotland - 12**

**Review: Lohrman, Martin, Stories
from Global Lutheranism-a
historical timeline. Fortress Press
(2021), pp. xi + 267. - 17**

A Letter from the Editor

Dear Friends,

Greetings to everybody. Unfortunately, covid is very much still with us, both globally and nationally, the latter despite the very high numbers of adults who have received one or two jabs. However, much reflection on the way in which Christian worship and fellowship can be maintained in such circumstances has occurred. As I type these initial lines in August, there is the threat of yet one more extraordinary climate event occurring in southern Europe.

In our recent webinars, we have devoted much time to church-state reflections, first with the Beckett 850th anniversary, then with the consideration of the diversity of church-state relations across the four nations of the UK. You will remember Keith Clements' contribution from the previous newsletter. The question of the rights, wrongs and problems posed by any sort of religious establishment have long been a source of debate. In 2011, three Anglican scholars, Mark Chapman, Judith Maltby and William Whyte edited a book, *The Established Church, Past, Present and Future*, in which various people looked at different aspects of the question.

It is worth remembering that the issue of Establishment is not limited to the question of state recognition of a particular Church as national Church. Ireland has not known that sort of establishment since 1869, but Northern Ireland still has the problem of the existence of confessionally aligned schools and their relation to wider division in that society.

I have inserted the addresses given on establishment in England, Wales and Scotland in this newsletter. I would also like to remind you that we have a further webinar on Sept 13, An ecclesial and ecumenical reading of Scripture the speakers being Fr. Nick King SJ, Diana Paulding and Pastor Daniel Akhazenea. Booking is by Eventbrite, and free to SES members. On Saturday, 23 October as a lead in to the COP26 summit in November, we have a day meeting on Zoom 11 am to 4 pm entitled Care for Creation, which includes several speakers from a very wide range of denominational heritages with experience and interest in key ecological issues. Further information will be coming from our secretary, Alison Evans sfes.secretary@gmail.com

Over the last decade, I have become increasingly interested in the one major ecumenically engaged Christian tradition which is little represented in the country. I refer to the Lutheran churches of which there are only a few congregations and a small number of embassy chaplaincies in the country- the nearest Lutheran congregations to my native Bristol are in Oxford and Cardiff.

Lutheranism has, however, become somewhat better known since the Millennium, partly as a result of the energetic work of Rev. Tom Bruch, then the secretary of the Lutheran Council in Great Britain and more recently Lutheran Dean. Tom was the first Lutheran to accept an invitation to join the then Theology and Unity Group of CTE, later becoming its chairperson for some years. He was also instrumental in the founding of the Anglican-Lutheran Society, a now flourishing body of about 300 members world-wide, helping to develop mutual knowledge amongst Anglicans of Lutherans of the partner tradition. The Society issues and excellent thrice yearly journal, The Window giving accounts of Anglican and Lutherans world-wide, with particular stress on those places where they work particularly closely together.

Like many, I had only the sketchiest knowledge of Lutheranism until about twenty years ago, but I now rejoice in my discovery of it, which has certainly increased the depth of my commitment to unity in legitimate diversity, a matter which Lutherans discovered from the time of the Augsburg Confession, well ahead of most others!

Below, you will find the papers from the Establishment seminar, followed by my review of Martin Lohrman's book.

David Carter

david@carterbristol.eclipse.co.uk

Church-State Relations: Church and State – an English Perspective

MALCOLM BROWN

Papers from the Seminar held on 16th June 2021

No discussion of Church and State in the English context can get far without coming up against the very large elephant of Establishment. So I propose to walk straight into the room and confront it head-on! Back in 2015, the National Theatre revived an early Twentieth Century play by Harley Granville Barker entitled “Waste”. It is a play about the conflicts between private and political morality but, interestingly, the political sub-plot turns on a Disestablishment Bill. Barker wrote the play originally in 1907, but it was barred by the Lord Chamberlain and not performed until he had rewritten it in 1926. Both versions were clearly influenced by the arguments about the disestablishment of the Church in Wales, with those arguments becoming concrete reality between the two texts.

For the NT revival, I was asked to act as a consultant to the Director and crew on what establishment was all about, what prompted disestablishmentarianism, and why it mattered. This was a very enjoyable assignment and I learned a great deal researching various arcane points derived from the script. I was also asked to write a programme note, explaining the arguments about establishment and disestablishment for an NT audience – who one might assume to be intelligent, interested, but probably predominantly secular in outlook. The very demanding challenge was to do this in 500 words. I recently looked again at what I had written and it was better than I remembered it. So as an introduction to the issues around an Established Church, here is what I wrote, with apologies for the pun on the title of the play:

Disestablishment – Laying Waste the Church of England?

Three hundred years after Jesus, the Emperor Constantine made Christianity the official faith of the Roman Empire ... and the church started learning what it meant to be powerful rather than persecuted.

That power built a world where sacred and secular were one. Human labour was an offering to God. Monasteries were centres of learning, medicine, and culture. In every community, the people built places of public worship, from humble parish churches to mighty cathedrals. This was Christendom, out of the Roman Empire by the New Testament – and, if the reality was less rosy, it nonetheless became a potent image of an ordered society.

But, as modern nation-states emerged, princes no longer felt inclined to bow before popes. The rise of nations, more than Anne Boleyn’s attractions, explains Henry VIII’s welding together of church, state and monarch in a newly defined, “established”, relationship. And revulsion against the ensuing religious warfare helps explain the Church of England’s commitment to the common good expressed in nation and community, its breadth of sympathies – and its unresolved tensions.

The modern state is a place of diversity and difference. By the twentieth century, Roman Catholics and Non-Conformists were prominent in public life. Other faith communities were becoming more visible. The Church of England still sought to serve the whole nation, not least through the schools and social care it had pioneered, but to be fully English no longer entailed being Anglican, and an Established Church had to negotiate tensions between an explicitly Christian world-view and seeking the good of all.



In 1920, delayed by the War, Parliament disestablished the Welsh church, spurring ambitions to end establishment in England too. But Welsh Christianity had been reinvigorated by chapel revivals, and Anglicanism in Wales represented alien authority. As with devolution today, what worked for Wales and Scotland was harder to translate to an English context.

The 1945 Welfare State absorbed much of the Church's social programme without appropriating its assets or taking on its responsibilities like the upkeep of thousands of iconic buildings. State and Church remained partners, but on a new footing. The Established Church continued to anoint the monarch. Bishops remained in the House of Lords where they had sat since Parliament began. England still saw itself as a Christian country. But plurality in religion and belief increasingly characterised society.

Asked his opinion of Christianity, Clement Attlee replied, "Believe in the ethics... can't believe the mumbo jumbo". Disestablishment sought a religion-less ethics, mobilising fellowship, altruism and self-sacrifice while jettisoning God and transcendence. But could disestablishment have delivered? As contemporary philosophers like Alasdair MacIntyre argue, ethics are meaningless without tradition, narrative, and community.

England is an old country with many illogical traditions evolved from history and compromise. If ethics needs tradition, perhaps the capacious, tentative and communitarian Anglican tradition is as good as any for uncertain times. Yet secularists still dream of a rational society, privatising religion for those who like that sort of thing. And some church people, who see tawdry politics corrupting pure religion, still wish the church had never heard of Constantine.

Disestablishmentarians fought to reframe the narrative about being English. Who would we be now, had they pulled it off?

For this webinar, I was asked to consider the question of why an established church could be justified for England when Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland did fine without one. I think there are two key observations to make in response to that.

First, why should one uniform system be right for every context? Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland are distinct nations with very distinct histories. To some extent, their historical identity – secular and religious – has been formed by not being England and by the tensions in their relationships with England. Having, in the case of Wales, successfully broken the ecclesiastical tether to England in 1920, it would be odd to argue that a unified structure was a self-evident good so long as it was disestablished.

Secondly, it has been observed recently in the context of nationalisms, that in a state made up of different nations, nationalism can have beneficial effects for the smaller nations – but that when nationalism takes hold in the largest nation, relational problems are likely to become intense. I suggest that the same applies to the matter of establishment. Disestablishment in some ways affirms the distinct identity of smaller nations, but were England to disestablish, I would expect the tide of secularism to sweep all before it, affect all nations in the Union. Religion would be perceived to have been vanquished from public life – which is a very different thing to being marginalised. And the procedural secularism which essentially characterises our societies now, could very easily give way to the programmatic secularism exemplified by the attempt by the first Welsh Senedd to make its building a religion-free zone. [1]

None of this would matter if establishment had no practical or theological foundation. But I believe it can actually give a reasonable account of itself on both scores. Not, perhaps, a complete, knock-down and unarguable case – but one worthy of serious consideration.

Pragmatically, the frequently voiced objection that having one established church is unfair on other churches and faiths is somewhat tempered by the fact that many leaders of other faith communities say they prefer to live in a country where religion is given an honoured place in the system than in the kind of secular state which is offered as an alternative. For, make no mistake, the alternative son offer today are not establishment versus religious pluralism but establishment versus a secular state where religion is privatised and thus forced out of public life.

1. For the distinction between procedural and programmatic secularisms, see, "Secularism, Faith and Freedom" in, Rowan Williams, *Faith in the Public Square*, Bloomsbury, 2012.

The idea that the only “fair” basis for political and social validity must be some version of statistical representativeness can, I think, be dismissed quite quickly. Fairness is a highly contested concept anyway but, too often, the only mechanism offered to secure fairness relies upon the ring being held by some “neutral” authority. But, if postmodernity has taught us anything, it is that there is no “person from nowhere” – neutrality itself has to be conceived within an ideology since there is no space outside one. Secular conceptions of religion in society assume that there is a neutral position which, presumably, believes nothing since it cannot believe everything. If this is not the case, then the usual arguments against an established church lose a great deal of their weight – which is not to say that there are no better disestablishment arguments, but we certainly hear little of them.

Theologically, time doesn’t allow me to go into much depth. Nor will a single theological argument ever close down debate! I have written more extensively on a possible theological foundation for establishment, and I can only canter through the argument here [2]. My case is that the English model of establishment reflects a theological model which distinguishes authority from power and grounds authority in powerlessness.

And so: the Lords bear the authority of tradition but are much less powerful than the Commons. Parliament derives its authority from the Monarch who has much less power than either House. The Monarch becomes the Monarch through anointing by a Church in the name of God, the Church having no significant power but deriving its authority from a God who is the source of all authority and is revealed to us in the utter powerlessness of a man on a Cross.

Power and authority operate on distinct gradients which lead in different directions. Simplistic, secular and modernist pyramids of power can’t capture this at all since they focus on power alone and conceive it to be the only hierarchy.

When power and authority are conflated – as, of course, when a church established or otherwise, harnesses temporal and political power – this theology is confounded. But the fundamental Christian insight that Christ’s authority is made visible in powerlessness seems to me to be, however tenuously, embodied in the kind of establishment where the church crowns the Monarch and other political institutions also locate authority in the less powerful parts of the structure.

This is, of course, only one theological argument. It doesn’t make dis- or non-established forms of religion wrong at all. Indeed, they pose a vital corrective to the constant temptation for the church itself to conflate authority with power. But I think it does indicate that establishment, as we see it in England, is not a theological aberration.

England is, as I said in the programme notes, an old country with many illogical but functional institutions, structures and practices. Many of the arguments against establishment rely implicitly on a modernist worldview at just the point in history where modernism is being found wanting. As John Milbank put it, postmodernity allows us to take a “half turn back” toward pre-modernity where we may be able to recapture the sublime beauty of the Christian narrative [3]. The Anglican model of an established church is essentially a pre-modern conception of church and state, even if it crystallised in the early decades of what is generally regarded as the modern period. That is not to say that models cannot and should not evolve – they do. Premodern solutions don’t look the same when applied to new contexts. But the argument that establishment must go because it is a relic with no practical or theological justification in a modern world doesn’t just get the church wrong – it gets the world wrong.

There may be many reasons why an established church is wrong for the church and for the State. But the arguments why it might be right deserve a much better hearing than they are getting in most debates right now.

2. Malcolm Brown, “Establishment: Some Theological Considerations” in *The Ecclesiastical Law Journal*. Vol.21, Issue 3, September 2019. pp.329–341.

3. John Milbank, “Postmodern Critical Augustinianism: A Short Summa in Forty two Responses to Unasked Questions”, in *Modern Theology*, Vol.7, No.3. 1990, pp.225–237.

Church and State in Wales: a holy or an unholy alliance?

BASED ON A PRESENTATION GIVEN TO THE SOCIETY FOR ECUMENICAL STUDIES ON 16TH JUNE 2021 BY REVD GETHIN RHYS, POLICY OFFICER, CYTŪN (CHURCHES TOGETHER IN WALES)

"I am grateful to the Society for this opportunity to present a brief account of a vast subject, alongside similar accounts from the other nations of the UK. The very different approaches taken by each of us reflect the equally different histories and circumstances of our nations.

For Wales, the last time that 'Church and State' could have been said to have interacted in the full sense of both words would be in the early Middle Ages, notably in the reign of Hywel Dda (942-948), noted for his contribution to codifying Welsh law, including relationships between church and state. As time is pressing tonight, I must refer you to Jenkins (1986) for more.

By the time of Magna Carta in 1215, Wales was ruled by a patchwork of lordships, owing allegiance to the English Crown. Paragraphs 56 and 57 of Magna Carta itself contained a promise by the King to judge disputes in Wales "according to the law of Wales" (rather than the law of England) – in effect, a form of devolution, with Wales able to make its own laws while remaining subservient to the English Crown (Magna Carta, 1215).

After the failure of the rebellion of Owain Glyndŵr in the early 15th century (the standard account is Davies, 1997) a series of Penal Laws were imposed on the Welsh in 1402. The second English King of Welsh descent, Henry VIII, was not happy with the disadvantages thus imposed on his ancestral people, and his solution was not devolution but centralisation. His parliaments passed the Laws in Wales Acts 1535 and 1542, making the laws in the two nations identical, and prohibiting the use of the Welsh language in the public realm. (These Acts are often erroneously called 'Acts of Union', but unlike the Acts of Union with Scotland or Ireland, Wales had no parliament which could consent to them – these were Acts of the Westminster Parliament only).

Although gradually repealed, the Acts can still be found on the legislation.gov.uk website.

Although these Acts barely touched on church and state, as we all know Henry VIII made enormous changes to the relationship between the two. Because of these Laws, the 'English Reformation' took legal effect in Wales too. The switch of worship in the Church of England from Latin to English was barely noticed in most of Wales – both languages were equally incomprehensible to the Welsh.

The Protestants at the English Court soon noticed that this meant that Protestant theology was failing to take root in Wales. Ironically, the next generation needed to reinvent Wales as a legal entity. The Established Church (and therefore the State) ordered that the Book of Common Prayer, Psalter and New Testament be translated into Welsh (1567), and subsequently the whole Bible (1588). These Welsh books had to be placed (along with their English counterparts) in each parish church in Wales. The Welsh language, extinguished in public life by order of the state in 1535, was restored to at least church life by order of the same state! This decision is widely credited with having saved the Welsh language, and therefore separate Welsh identity – contrast the situation in Cornwall, where no translations were provided.

For the ensuing centuries, therefore, the fate of the Church (of England) and the (English) State in Wales were inextricably intertwined. The Commonwealth Parliament in 1650 passed the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales Act, to try to speed the laborious process of turning the Welsh into a Protestant people (see Williams, 1993). Although the Act was repealed after the Restoration in 1660,

It sowed the seeds for the growth of what became Welsh Nonconformity, much hastened by the Methodist Revival of the 18th century (led in Wales not by the Wesleys, but by Howell Harris, Daniel Rowland and William Williams. On this and other aspects of church history in Wales, the best introduction is Morgans & Noble, 2016). Thus the Welsh became largely Protestant not through the established Church of England, but through nonconformity.

This in turn reignited the question of the relationship between Church and State – or perhaps between people and Established Church – in Wales. A strong movement grew in the 19th century for disestablishing the Church of England in Wales, especially after that happened in Ireland in 1870. This proved to be a slow process, with initially a number of other Acts of Parliament, heavily influenced by that issue, including:

- The Sunday Closing (Wales) Act 1881 which closed public houses in Wales, in line with the Nonconformist conscience, subject to ten-yearly referendums in each county.
- The Welsh Intermediate and Technical Education Act 1889, which established a system of Local Education Authorities responsible for secondary and technical education in their areas a full 12 years before England – not least because of pressure for the state to provide non-denominational education to older children, previously largely the preserve of the Church of England.

These culminated in the Welsh Church Act 1914, disestablishing and disendowing the Church of England in Wales. The First World War delayed implementation until 1920, so the Church in Wales celebrated its centenary (as best it could during a pandemic) in 2020, not least by the publication of Doe (2020), now the standard work on disestablishment and the subsequent century of Anglican history in Wales.

This new relationship between Church and State made Wales a nation without an established church. But it also remained without its own state. The Welsh Courts Act 1942 permitted the use of the Welsh language in court proceedings in Wales for the first time since 1535 – not least because of the number of Welsh speaking Christian conscientious objectors whose cases needed to be heard.

Further Welsh Language Acts followed in 1967 and 1993, and the Welsh-speaking nonconformist churches were amongst those pressing for these reforms.

In March 1979, a referendum was called by the Labour Government on creating a non-legislative Assembly for Wales, alongside the much more powerful parliament proposed for Scotland. Some Welsh denominations campaigned for a 'Yes' vote, but despite the referendum being held on St David's Day, the proposal was defeated overwhelmingly in every part of Wales. This contributed to the parliamentary defeat of the Government and the calling of a General Election in May 1979 which led to 18 years of Conservative Governments.

Events of this period – notably the closure of the coal mines and much other heavy industry in Wales, and the struggle to establish a Welsh language television channel – led to the possibility of some kind of devolution for Wales re-entering political debate remarkably swiftly after such a resounding defeat. Churches in Wales were involved in various ways in these discussions, but those that had been on the losing side in 1979 were naturally cautious about involvement in partisan and constitutional argument.

The Council of Churches for Wales had been quite vocal on many social issues (see Davies, 2008), but its replacement by Cytûn in 1990, following the 1988 Swanwick conference, led to a different pattern of ecumenism across the nations of Britain. In order to accommodate the membership of the Catholic and some Pentecostal churches, it was agreed that the new Churches Together bodies would have no power to make authoritative statements on public issues unless there was unanimity amongst the member churches through their usual decision-making processes. Such unanimity is rare! Thus each church must make its own approach to the state – relationships must be between churches and state. This change has had a profound effect on church involvement in public affairs across Great Britain – perhaps the subject for another SfES Seminar?

However, in Wales an opportunity arose unexpectedly during the period when John Redwood MP was Secretary of State for Wales. He was not universally popular – and the title which he subsequently gave to his online diary, *Speaking for England*, may indicate why. (Ironically, he abandoned the strapline on St David's Day 2021 – Redwood, 2021). In 1993 Mr Redwood made a speech to Conservative activists in Wales blaming social problems on the St Mellons housing estate in east Cardiff on the high prevalence of single mothers (see Waterhouse & Bennetto, 1993) (The estate in question, incidentally, is of note to ecumenists as the home of a 5-denominational local ecumenical partnership, the Church of the Resurrection, established under the Covenant for Unity in Wales). Cytûn's church leaders sought a meeting with Mr Redwood to discuss the matter. This was eventually secured, although those who were there say that Mr Redwood appeared not to be listening. Nonetheless, this sparked the decision to produce a church discussion document on aspects of family and social morality in Wales, published in 1996 under the title *Wales: A Moral Society?* (Cytûn, 1996). While the first chapter began by responding to Mr Redwood's comments by discussing questions around the family, it went on to discuss issues such as housing, the economy, and the constitutional future of Wales.

Mr Redwood had in 1995 left his post in Wales in order to challenge John Major MP – unsuccessfully – for leadership of the Conservative Party. However, he had – unwittingly, no doubt – inspired the churches' first ecumenical engagement with the issues that would face a new Welsh state. The election of a Labour Government in May 1997 led to a referendum in September 1997 which, by the narrowest of margins, approved the establishment of what became the National Assembly for Wales. Some churches campaigned in favour and none campaigned against, however the majority remained neutral.

The momentum created in the churches by *Wales: A Moral Society?* inspired a number of them to work together to create the post of Churches' National Assembly Liaison Officer.

The first Liaison Officer, Revd Aled Edwards, was in post prior to the first elections to the new Assembly in May 1999, and for once the churches were ahead of the game in public affairs. Christian churches were amongst the few civil society organisations to establish such an office from the dawn of Welsh devolution, and the role quickly established itself.

Through the work of Aled Edwards, churches were thus involved in building this new devolved state. Soon, the member churches of Cytûn were unanimous in supporting the post, and it became part of the staff establishment of the Welsh ecumenical instrument. The churches thus played a key part in establishing new state institutions such as the Voluntary (now Third Sector) Partnership Council and the Faith Communities Forum – established after the 9/11 atrocity – and voluntary bodies such as the Inter-faith Council for Wales, which have strengthened the voice of faith in public affairs in Wales, and therefore the relationship between church and state.

The National Assembly was established with very limited legislative powers, but one landmark was the Welsh Language (Wales) Measure 2011, which gave the Welsh language official status in Wales, and finally repealed the language clauses of the Laws in Wales Acts – completing the repeal of those Acts in their entirety. Then in March 2011 a further referendum was held to give the Senedd full law-making powers in the devolved policy areas (such as health, education, economic development, housing, agriculture and the environment). The ballot paper itself contained the following words: *If most voters vote 'yes' – the Assembly will be able to make laws on all matters in the 20 subject areas it has powers for, without needing the UK Parliament's agreement.* The result was a clear majority for 'Yes'.

The standing of the churches in this new state had been acknowledged during the preceding years by the inclusion of Aled Edwards on the All-Wales Convention which produced the proposals which led to the referendum (see Williamson, 2008 and IWA, 2009). Aled represented not just Cytûn, but the whole membership of the Faith Communities Forum, indicating that in contemporary Wales the relationship is between not church and state but faith and state.

Most churches remained neutral in the 2011 referendum campaign, although the then (Anglican) Archbishop of Wales, Barry Morgan, was prominent in a campaigning body called 'Cymru Yfory' (Tomorrow's Wales) which campaigned for a Yes vote (Shipton, 2015).

While acknowledging all the changes in church, state and society over 8 centuries, it can be said that the 2011 result brought the relationship between Wales and England back to that envisaged by Magna Carta in 1215! Over the ensuing ten years the National Assembly (now renamed 'Senedd' or Welsh Parliament) has developed in partnership with faith groups as well as others in civil society. The best known legislation passed has been the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015, incorporating the United Nations Development Goals into law for the first time anywhere in the world. Key amendments agreed during the passage of the Bill were promoted by the Sustainable Development Alliance, of which Christian Aid was a key member on behalf of the churches in Wales (see Future Generations Commissioner, 2021 and SD Alliance, 2021).

The first Llywydd (Presiding Officer) of the National Assembly was (Lord) Dafydd Elis-Thomas. Despite being a committed member of the Church in Wales, he was insistent that the institution should be 'secular', and initially neither religious chaplaincy nor any other overtly religious activity were permitted on the premises – although an annual 'carol concert' including Christian carols and Biblical readings did take place! However, his successors have taken a different view of the nature of 'secularity' and have permitted events in the Senedd held by the Muslim Council for Wales, Evangelical Alliance and National Prayer Breakfasts, amongst others, as well as Humanists Cymru. One of the most moving moments for me at the Senedd was when at an Evangelical Alliance event, members of the Ethiopian and Eritrean Orthodox Churches were able to worship together – even though so many members of both communities had fled to Wales from the war between the two nations.

Less formally, the steps at the front of the Senedd building in Cardiff Bay have become a favourite venue not only for political demonstrations of all kinds,

but also for vigils following terrorist atrocities and other tragedies. Each event has been led by members of all faith communities, and First Ministers of Wales, Llywyddion y Senedd (Presiding Officers) and other elected members have spoken at these events, surrounded by representatives of all faiths.

More recently, a Salvation Army officer has been appointed as a chaplain to members of the Senedd and its staff. Previous 'chaplains' had been church appointments (some through the ecumenical Lightship, anchored close to the Senedd – sadly now towed away – and others by the Church in Wales denominationally) and have had no access to the Senedd beyond that afforded to members of the public generally. However, the current chaplain is recognised by the Senedd Commission, has an office in the members' area and as well as offering his own support acts as a signpost to spiritual support from other faith traditions. The role was created at the instigation of the Cross-Party Group on Faith – which has been an important meeting point for Senedd Members and faith communities. At the first meeting of the Group following the 2021 elections, it was heartening to see members of all four political parties represented in the Senedd.

New developments continually challenge the relationship between the devolved Welsh state and the UK state of which it is part. Devolution was devised on the assumption of continued UK membership of the European Union. During the 2016 referendum, neutrality held sway amongst the churches of Wales and Cytûn – although the Bench of Bishops of the Church in Wales informed the public that they personally were voting for Remain (Williamson, 2016), and Aled Edwards (now Chief Executive of Cytûn) was a member of the Board of Wales in Europe.

When the result went in favour of leaving the EU, and the UK's membership ended in 2020, it raised significant questions about the future. In particular, the UK Internal Market Act 2020 reintroduced a requirement for UK Parliament or Government consent to significant areas of devolved legislation – contrary to the 2011 referendum ballot paper statement *If most voters vote 'yes' – the Assembly will be able to make laws on all matters in the 20 subject areas it has powers for, without needing the UK Parliament's agreement.*

The neutrality of the churches in the referendum campaign bore fruit during this period, however. Three of Cytûn's member denominations passed resolutions at their annual Assemblies shortly after the referendum calling on the churches to work together on the consequences of the result. A Working Party first met in August 2016 and was soon endorsed by all Cytûn member churches. As in 1999, the churches were amongst the first institutions in civil society to respond to a new situation and the Working Party has played an important role in subsequent public debate. A notable occasion was the then First Minister, Carwyn Jones AM, meeting with the General Secretaries of the ecumenical bodies of Europe (within and outside the EU) in Cardiff on the day before the 2017 General Election – giving up a morning's electoral campaigning to do so.

Despite many challenges, I believe it can be said that in Wales, faith (not just church) and state are in a productive, perhaps even holy, alliance. Through formal and informal relationships, the role of faith in the lives of many of the population is acknowledged and even celebrated by the Senedd and Welsh Government, and the role of the devolved institutions is acknowledged and even celebrated by most faith groups. Long may this alliance continue.

Bibliography (all websites accessed 16.08.21)

Cytûn (1996), *Wales: A Moral Society?* (Cytûn: Churches Together in Wales, Cardiff)

Davies, N.A. (2008), *A History of Ecumenism in Wales, 1956-1990* (University of Wales Press)

Davies, R.R. (1997), *The Revolt of Owain Glyn Dŵr* (Oxford University Press)

Doe, N. (ed., 2020), *A New History of the Church in Wales: Governance and Ministry, Theology and Society* (Cambridge University Press)

Future Generations Commissioner (2021), 'Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015' at <https://www.futuregenerations.wales/about-us/future-generations-act/>

IWA (Institute for Welsh Affairs) (2009), 'Convention Special 1: What it Says' at <https://www.iwa.wales/agenda/2009/11/convention-special-1-what-it-says/>

Jenkins, D. (1986), *Hywel Dda – The Law* (Texts of Medieval Wales vol. 2) (Gwasg Gomer, Llandysul)

Laws in Wales Act 1535 (repealed) at <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/Hen8/27/26/contents>

Laws in Wales Act 1542 (repealed) at <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/Hen8/34-35/26/contents>

Magna Carta (1215), as translated by the National Archives at <https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/resources/magna-carda/british-library-magna-carda-1215-runnymede/>

Morgans, J.I. & Noble, P.C. (2016), *Our Holy Ground: The Welsh Christian Experience* (Y Lolfa, Talybont)

Penal Laws (1402), as extracted and translated by the National Archives at http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/utk/wales/popup/penal_trans.htm

Redwood, J. (2021), 'Speaking for England' in John Redwood's Diary at <https://johnredwoodsdiary.com/2021/03/01/speaking-for-england-3/>

SD Alliance (2021), 'Who We Are' at <http://www.shapingfuturewales.org/en/who-we-are/>

Shipton, M. (2015), 'Cymru Yfory – one of the key campaigners for devolution – set to merge with the Institute for Welsh Affairs' in *Wales Online* 2 June 2015 at <https://www.walesonline.co.uk/news/wales-news/cymru-yfory---one-key-9379265>

Waterhouse, R. & Benetto, J. (1993), 'Tories clash over single mothers' in *The Independent* 3 July 1993 at <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/tories-clash-over-single-mothers-lilley-rejects-demand-to-axe-benefits-1482903.html>

Williams, G. (1993), 'Propagating the Gospel' in Jenkins, G.H. (ed.), *The Foundations of Modern Wales: Wales 1642-1780* (Oxford University Press)
Williamson, D. (2008), 'All-Wales Convention members named' on *Wales Online* 4 July 2008 at <https://www.walesonline.co.uk/news/wales-news/all-wales-convention-members-named-2162321>

Williamson, D. (2016), 'Church in Wales bishops condemn 'demonisation' of immigrants in EU debate' in *Wales Online* 16 June 2016 at <https://www.walesonline.co.uk/news/politics/church-wales-bishops-condemn-demonisation-11481954>

Presbyterianism, from Patronage to Percy: Church and State in Scotland [1]

LAURA DUNLOP QC

Introduction

1. In 2001, I was appearing in a case in the Court of Session with no connection to ecclesiastical matters. In fact, it was about vodka and whisky. My opponent referenced a 19th Century case, but had momentarily misplaced its citation. 'It's around 1870 I think' he said, hopefully. One of the judges, Lord Rodger of Earlsferry, expert on church history, exclaimed 'but Mr Jones – it's a Disruption case!'

2. For those unable to translate this coded exchange, the Disruption refers to the walkout of a large proportion of the delegates from the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1843. In what was obviously a carefully choreographed move, they marched to Tanfield Hall in Canonmills on the north side of Edinburgh, where many more ministers and elders were waiting. Thus was the Free Church born.

3. The then rival Assembly was captured as a group portrait by the artist, David Octavius Hill. The painting was completed with the use of photographic images, the first work of art thus composed, according to the University of Glasgow, which holds some of the companion photographs. [2]

4. The ministers who left chose to give up their homes and their livings rather than surrender the spiritual independence of their Church. What had led to this secession and are the factors relevant today? To answer that, we must begin by travelling further back in time. [3]

Part 1 - Patronage

5. A reasonable place to start is around the time of the Union of Scotland and England, in 1707. In 1707, the Scottish Parliament passed the Protestant Religion and Presbyterian Church Act, providing that Presbyterian Church Government and Discipline was to remain and continue unalterable in Scotland.

This legislation was part of the run-up to the Treaty of Union with England, approval of which by the Parliament of Scotland expressly mentioned observation of the terms of the Presbyterian Church Act as a fundamental and essential condition of the Treaty of Union.

Yet in 1711, the UK Parliament passed the Church Patronage (Scotland) Act, reintroducing a system of patronage which had been abolished in Scotland in 1690.

6. The effect was to create a right in the Crown or a local landowner to nominate a man who was licensed by the Church as a preacher, to fill a vacancy in a parish. The local Presbytery was obliged to accept this nomination, irrespective of the wishes of the congregation concerned. Formal protest against the Patronage Act was made at the General Assembly every year until 1784. After some respite, at a time when the Church was dominated by the 'moderates', the early years of the 19th Century saw a rise in the evangelical wing of the Church of Scotland and renewed opposition to the institution of patronage, especially after the passage of the 1832 Reform Acts. The Scottish electoral reforms [4] effected by the Representation of the People (Scotland) Act 1832, increased the electorate in Scotland by 1400% [5]. Among those involved in promoting the legislation were individuals also associated with the opposition to patronage in the Church. If there was to be reform of patronage, what form should it take: should patronage be abolished, or regulated?

1. Although the experiences I draw on have been gained in my role as Procurator (Standing QC) to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, an office I have held since 2005, the views expressed here are personal.

2. [https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/archivespecialcollections/discover/specialcollectionsa-z/hilladamson/disruptionpicture/#:~:text=the%20University%20Collection\)-,The%20Disruption%20Picture,the%20help%20of%20photographic%20images](https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/archivespecialcollections/discover/specialcollectionsa-z/hilladamson/disruptionpicture/#:~:text=the%20University%20Collection)-,The%20Disruption%20Picture,the%20help%20of%20photographic%20images).

3. I have drawn extensively on the research of Lord Rodger in his book, *The Courts, the Church and the Constitution* (Edinburgh University Press, 2008) and on Francis Lyall's book, *Of Presbyters and Kings* (Aberdeen University Press, 1980). A further study of the Disruption is *The Political Theory of the Disruption*, Harold J. Laski, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 10, No. 3 (Aug. 1916), 437.

7. In the absence of any Parliamentary proposals for abolition, the Church decided to pass its own legislation stipulating for the right of a congregation (more specifically, a majority of male communicant heads of families in a parish) to object to the patron's choice of a minister. In 1834, the General Assembly passed an interim Act, creating this veto, which became final in 1835 as the Veto Act.

8. Meanwhile, in Auchterarder in Perthshire, a Mr Young had been nominated as minister by the Earl of Kinnoull, but 287 out of a possible 330 male heads of families recorded their dissent from Mr Young's call. Only two signed. In October 1835, a case was raised in the Court of Session on behalf of Mr Young and the Earl, objecting to the decision of the Presbytery of Auchterarder to refuse to call Mr Young.

A hearing took place in the Court of Session over ten days in December 1837. It is not difficult to deduce the territory on which battle was joined: the objections to Mr Young were based on the Veto Act, which was a Church Act, but his rights, and those of the patron, were based on an Act of Parliament. Should the identity of the parish minister be determined according to provisions of secular law, or was it a spiritual matter, jurisdiction over which belonged, and only belonged, to the Church? And who had the right to determine if this was a civil or spiritual matter?

9. It took six days alone to deliver the judgements. By a majority of 8: 5 the judges found for Mr Young and the Earl. There were two principal bases of the judgement: firstly, the subject-matter of the dispute was not exclusively spiritual, since patrimonial rights were involved. Secondly, the Church Courts, including the General Assembly, could not contradict the provisions of an Act of Parliament.

10. An appeal was marked to the House of Lords by the Presbytery but was wholly unsuccessful, judgement being issued at the beginning of May 1839.

11. At the same time, and over the ensuing few years, there were other skirmishes, and differing positions regarding tactics. Should the General Assembly repeal the Veto Act? Was there a way of decoupling the civil rights of a minister and patron from the purely spiritual question of induction by the Presbytery? Would the Government and/or Parliament indicate sympathy for the position of the 'non-intrusionists' as they were known, and look to reform the Patronage Act?

12. Suffice to say that no solution was found, to what was a hugely significant crisis for the church and for Scotland. As the non-intrusionist Lord Cockburn observed, the majority judges did not say what Christ would have done if faced with an order from a civil court about the identity of his apostles.

13. Against this background, a convocation of ministers met in Edinburgh in November 1842. Resolutions were published, although the deliberations were kept secret. In January 1843, Peel's government in London rejected the Church's representations. Further reverses for the Church occurred in the civil courts.

14. This, then, is the background to the Disruption. Most of the ministers who had attended the convocation, and others too, left the Church of Scotland. In setting up the new church, they and their followers left the security of the established church. With some justification, Lord Cockburn described it as 'one of the finest acts of principle that had been seen'.

Part 2 - Legislation

15. After this, the Church in Scotland had decades of difficulty. There were other schisms. Time does not permit exploration of the subsequent genesis of the Free Presbyterian Church or the emergence of the United Free Church. We need to fast forward to the 1920s, for which journey I can quote a paragraph from Francis Lyall, [6]

In all the proceedings of the period 1843 – 1929 however, although there is a move towards the granting of greater freedom of action to the Church, yet that grant was always made by the intervention of the State, and the civil courts continued to have an important role in disputes under the Act. New parishes were more easily to be established and their ministers were given full status, but only under statute. Even the requirements of the Church as to doctrinal profession of ministers was a matter in which the State had the last say. Although power was granted to the Assembly, yet 'what Caesar gives, Caesar may take away'. The established Church was therefore gaining freedom, but freedom, as it were, on a lead. Such powers as it had were given to it by the State, and were not inherent in it ex natura.

4. It is noteworthy that, prior to the reforms for Scotland, Edinburgh's MP was elected by 33 men. (Rab Houston (2008), Scotland: A Very Short Introduction, p. 26).

5. Ibid.

In all the proceedings of the period 1843 – 1929 however, although there is a move towards the granting of greater freedom of action to the Church, yet that grant was always made by the intervention of the State, and the civil courts continued to have an important role in disputes under the Act. New parishes were more easily to be established and their ministers were given full status, but only under statute. Even the requirements of the Church as to doctrinal profession of ministers was a matter in which the State had the last say. Although power was granted to the Assembly, yet ‘what Caesar gives, Caesar may take away’. The established Church was therefore gaining freedom, but freedom, as it were, on a lead. Such powers as it had were given to it by the State, and were not inherent in it ex natura.

16. Early in the 20th Century, thoughts turned to ecclesiastical union, especially after formation of the United Free Church in 1900, from the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church. It was obvious that the Church of Scotland, which had survived a campaign for its disestablishment at the end of the 19th Century, would wish to retain established status. It was equally obvious that the United Free Church would be intolerant of State intervention in matters spiritual.

17. In 1912, my predecessor as Procurator, Christopher Johnston, later Lord Sands, prepared a Memorandum, which proposed that the Church of Scotland seek a reformulation of its constitution, to be approved by the State. Negotiations between the two churches followed and the result was the Articles Declaratory, which are contained in the Schedule to the Church of Scotland Act 1921. This was the basis for union of the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church, in 1929.

18. For our purposes, the most important Articles are IV and VI.

IV...The church receives from Christ, and from him alone, the right and power subject to no civil authority to legislate, and to adjudicate finally, in all matters of doctrine, worship, government, and discipline in the Church, including the right to determine all questions concerning membership and office in the Church, the constitution and membership of its Courts, and the mode of election of its office-bearers, and to define the boundaries of the spheres of labour of its ministers and other office-bearers.

Recognition by civil authority of the separate and independent government and jurisdiction of this Church in matters spiritual, in whatever manner such recognition be expressed, does not in any way affect the character of this government and jurisdiction as derived from the Divine Head of the Church alone, or give to the civil authority any right of interference with the proceedings or judgments of the Church within the sphere of its spiritual government and jurisdiction.

8. For our purposes, the most important Articles are IV and VI.

IV...The church receives from Christ, and from him alone, the right and power subject to no civil authority to legislate, and to adjudicate finally, in all matters of doctrine, worship, government, and discipline in the Church, including the right to determine all questions concerning membership and office in the Church, the constitution and membership of its Courts, and the mode of election of its office-bearers, and to define the boundaries of the spheres of labour of its ministers and other office-bearers. Recognition by civil authority of the separate and independent government and jurisdiction of this Church in matters spiritual, in whatever manner such recognition be expressed, does not in any way affect the character of this government and jurisdiction as derived from the Divine Head of the Church alone, or give to the civil authority any right of interference with the proceedings or judgments of the Church within the sphere of its spiritual government and jurisdiction.

VI...The Church and the State owe mutual duties to each other, and acting within their respective spheres may signally promote each other's welfare. The Church and the State have the right to determine each for itself all questions concerning the extent and the continuance of their mutual relations in the discharge of these duties and the obligations arising therefrom.

19. Thus, from Article IV of the Church's constitution, all matters specified – doctrine, worship, government and discipline – are spiritual matters. In these matters, the Church, and the Church alone, has the right to legislate and to adjudicate finally. From Article VI, determination of the boundaries of the respective spheres of influence is for each. The potential for difference of view as to jurisdiction is obvious

20. The body of the 1921 Act itself is simple – the constitution of the Church in all matters spiritual is set forth in the Articles. [7] In all questions of construction, the Declaratory Articles shall prevail. [8]

21. So the Act represented much greater freedom of action for the Church than previously. But what are the limits to that?

Part 3 - Percy

22. In 1991, Helen Percy was ordained as a minister of the Church of Scotland. In 1994, she was appointed as associate minister to a parish in Angus. In 1997, allegations of an affair between Ms Percy and a married elder in the congregation came to light. Ms Percy was suspended pending a disciplinary investigation. Various other steps followed. Ultimately, she demitted status, then made a claim of sex discrimination, based on the proposition that male members of the clergy in relation to whom similar allegations were made were treated more leniently than she had been.

23. The Church successfully resisted the claim at an Industrial Tribunal (nowadays these are Employment Tribunals) and, on appeal by Ms Percy, before the Employment Appeal Tribunal and the First Division of the Court of Session. When I took over as Procurator in the Spring of 2005, the case had been appealed to the House of Lords, with a hearing set down for the Autumn.

24. There were two key points in the argument in the House of Lords. Firstly, since claims of sex discrimination are only open to those who work under contract, did Ms Percy fall into that category? Secondly, what was the effect of the 1921 Act on the claim? The second is relevant to tonight's discussion. In short, the issue became about the boundary between the civil and spiritual spheres.

25. A majority of the judges were unpersuaded by the 1921 Act's exclusive jurisdiction, and Ms Percy succeeded in her appeal, by 4 to 1 [9]. The reasoning of the majority was expressed in various ways, but typical are

Lord Nicholls

[40] ...The expression 'matters spiritual' is not defined. [10] But, on any ordinary understanding of this expression, if the church authorities enter into a contract of employment with one of its ministers, the exercise of statutory rights attached to the contract would not be regarded as a spiritual matter. A sex discrimination claim would not be regarded as a spiritual matter even though it is based on the way the church authorities are alleged to have exercised their disciplinary jurisdiction. A sex discrimination claim would not be regarded as a spiritual matter even though it is based on the way the church authorities are alleged to have exercised their disciplinary jurisdiction.

Lord Hope

[132] ...A claim of unlawful discrimination in the employment field ... may have something to do with the way that discipline is exercised, and it may also have something to do with the way a person is deprived of an office in the Church. ...

[133] Article IV of the declaratory articles is sufficiently broadly worded for it to be possible, without prejudice in any way to its generality, to say on which side of the dividing line between matters civil and matters spiritual this case lies. In my opinion the provision of a remedy for unlawful discrimination is a civil matter, not a spiritual one. So the exercise of the exclusive jurisdiction of the Church in spiritual matters does not extend to a claim by persons 'employed' by the respondents within the meaning of sec 82(1) of the 1975 Act that they have been unlawfully discriminated against.

Lady Hale

[152] ... But the processes whereby they [the Church] make decisions about membership and office may be subject to the ordinary laws of the land. It will all depend upon what that law says and means. It would be surprising indeed if Parliament, when enacting a law in 1975 to combat defined acts of discrimination in defined areas of activity which were, as already seen, capable of encompassing employment for the purposes of an organised religion, including the established Church, contemplated that, alone of all such organised religions, the Church of Scotland should be immune

7. Section 1 of the Act

8. *ibid*

9. The Law Report is 2006 SC (HL) 1

10. In oral argument, Lord Hoffmann, who dissented from the majority, observed that matters spiritual are defined in Article IV.

26. It is right to recognise that, on the first of the key points referred to above, some of the dicta in Percy about the intention to create a legally binding relationship between a minister and their church – a contract, in other words – are difficult to reconcile with the dicta of Lord Sumption in a further Supreme Court discrimination case, *Moore v President of the Methodist Conference* [11]

27. The existence of contracts of employment, whether actual or deemed by a Court, and the consequences (particularly in relation to discrimination claims) of finding that a contract exists, are of course another aspect of the relationship between Church and State. On that matter, to quote Lord Justice Maurice Kay in the Court of Appeal in *Moore*, ‘the tectonic plates’ moved in Percy. [12]

Conclusions

28. So what can be concluded about the relationship of Church and State in Scotland?

29. First, and obviously, everything here is about the Church of Scotland. I cannot speak about other churches in Scotland, each of which will have its own perspective on Church/State relations. Moreover, although the Church of Scotland is the only candidate for the position of established church in Scotland, it is not established in the same way as the Church of England. Apart from having a denomination-wide authorisation to solemnise marriage between persons of different sexes, and some representation on educational advisory committees, the Church of Scotland is not woven into the fabric of government, whether at a local, national (Scottish) or UK level.

30. Secondly, notwithstanding the 1921 Act apparently ring-fencing issues concerning doctrine, worship, government and discipline, and conferring exclusive jurisdiction over them upon the Church, a fundamental issue in an individual dispute will be the threshold one of characterisation.

Necessarily, in a claim brought in the civil courts, it would require those courts to decline jurisdiction for the provisions of the 1921 Act to be given effect. That may not happen if there can be said to be any element of civil or patrimonial rights involved in the case.

31. Thirdly, since in law ‘context is everything’, [13] declinature of jurisdiction by state authorities causing members of the clergy to be deprived of rights available to other workers is unattractive. This, in itself, is likely to encourage a sparing approach to jurisdictional exclusion.

32. Finally, in the 19th century, the pursuit of greater democracy in appointment of ministers, reflecting electoral reform in civil society, created a situation where the civil law of patronage became intolerable for a proportion of church members and ministers.

The Disruption was triggered, with its far-reaching consequences for Presbyterian churches and their members in Scotland, and its continuing legacy of the preciousness of the congregational Call. At the end of the 20th century, the civil law of equality and non-discrimination reached into the church and again affected how (some) ministers could be appointed to or dismissed from their posts. Separated by more than 150 years, and involving very different factual scenarios, there may nevertheless be a common element. Albeit in opposite directions, the clash on each occasion was between an established order of power and privilege, and the impact of expanding individual rights.

Laura Dunlop QC
June 2021



11. The law report of *Moore* is [2013] 2 AC 163.

12. The report of the Court of Appeal decision is [2012] QB 735; the tectonic plates crop up in para 25. Perhaps less vividly, in para 64 of *New Testament Church of God v Stewart* [2008] ICR 282, Lady Arden referred to Percy being an example of the courts “fulfilling their time-honoured role of updating the common law and making it more suitable for modern circumstances”.

13. Lord Steyn in *R (Daly) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department* [2001] 2 AC 532, para 28.

Lohrman, Martin, Stories from Global Lutheranism-a historical timeline. Fortress Press (2021), pp. xi + 267.

The title of this book may give the initially misleading impression that it is purely anecdotal, albeit 'improving' in the Victorian sense. It is, however, the work of a Lutheran pastor and seminary professor, well versed in his tradition, and able to explain it clearly in terms that do not demand too much prior specialist knowledge.

It is a book which will give a useful introduction to the study of a major Christian tradition, one that is relatively little known in Britain, where the number of Lutherans is small and their parishes few. The nearest communities to my native city of Bristol are in Cardiff, over forty miles away and Oxford, about sixty. There are, of course, also embassy chaplains and churches for particular national Lutheran communities in London. Over the last twenty-five years, Lutherans have become somewhat better known in Britain through developing links with Churches Together in England and the setting up of the Anglican-Lutheran Society, both initiatives in which the Rev. Tom Bruch, an American Lutheran pastor resident in England, has played a key role.

Lohrmann begins his book with an introduction, entitled 'Living Stones and Faith rocks', making it clear that, for Luther and his disciples, the rock upon which Christ said His Church would be built was Peter's confession of faith in Himself, Jesus, rather than any institution or church structure as such. At stake is faith in Christ and his power rather than in any merit, or holiness, of our own.

Lohrmann then follows this with five chapters, each dealing with one of the five complete centuries since the alleged nailing of the ninety five theses to the door of Wittenburg Church in 1517. He concludes with a brief and optimistic look at what the sixth Lutheran century may bring. He is confident that 'the future of a healthy Lutheranism will include a loving embrace of global contexts and cultures, co-operation with secular and religious partners for the well being of people and creation, and a conviction that the gospel of Jesus Christ transforms people for love and service'. It may seem to the non-Lutheran reader that these aims are now universally accepted amongst the ecumenically committed Christian churches at large, including the very church with which Luther was once so passionately in conflict.

Much of the convergence is due to the Ecumenical Movement of the past century, in which Lutherans have, indeed, played a key role, a role perhaps rather underplayed in Lohrmann's fifth chapter, where he has been understandably keen to stress the growth of Lutheranism in the global south.

Lohrmann's first chapter describes the beginning of the movement that Luther initiated for reform in the existing medieval Church. He explains the roles of Luther and Melanchthon, his key aide. He perhaps underplays Melanchthon's attempts at a mediating role with Rome (surprisingly, there is no mention of the attempted reconciliation of the Colloquy of Ratisbon in 1541) and the rival Swiss reformers. Lohrmann deals deftly with the complex political tensions that played such a role in ensuring that Lutheranism was able to gain the support of some key German princes and an established place in their dominions. He outlines the key importance of the Augsburg Confession of 1530, the later accord of 1555, which brought peace until 1620, and the spread of Lutheranism amongst many German settlements beyond the Holy Roman Empire, in eastern Europe. Lohrmann also emphasises the flexibility of Lutheranism where church order and liturgy were concerned. Different systems could exist provided there was agreement on the basic truth of justification by faith, on the statements of the historic creeds of the early Church and on the two sacraments of baptism and eucharist, Luther and Melanchthon alike maintaining that they were doing nothing new, simply affirming the universal faith of the early Church whilst allowing for local customs and traditions to flourish in variety, provided the preaching of the Word and the two gospel sacraments were maintained. Lohrmann also shows how Lutheranism spread, relatively very peacefully, to Scandinavia.

One of the admirable features of this book is that it admits the warts and all side of Luther. There is no attempt to conceal Luther's anti-semitism, let alone excuse it. It is seen as a 'perversion of his own teachings about radical grace and divine love.'

Similarly, there is no attempt to deny other forms of racism that have sometimes disfigured 'white' Lutheranism, including both settlers in colonies and missionaries. A key Lutheran belief has always been that all people, including devout Lutherans and other Christians, always remain liable to sin; we are all 'simul Justus et peccator', both forgiven, yet liable still to sin.

Lohrmann also usefully disabuses us of any misunderstanding of Luther's oft cited reference to the epistle of James as a 'strawy epistle'. This was not to reject it entirely or devalue its ethical teaching, which Luther, elsewhere, underlined. It was simply to stress that it did not contribute much to the key stress on justification by grace through faith.

Considerable emphasis is placed on the development of hymnology within Lutheranism, a key factor in its expansion and appeal to popular piety. Whilst Catholics only used office hymns, and other Protestants were confined to metrical psalms, the Lutherans were free to express their devotion to Christ in a growing hymnology. It is, one might add, no accident that when the Wesleys discovered the power of hymnody in the English Methodist Revival, they also translated many of the German Lutheran hymns, particularly those of the pietists.

Lohrmann's second century, 1617-1717, embraces many developments, including the first signs of Lutheran globalisation as Swedish Lutherans set up a small colony in North America and even began a tentative mission to the indigenous population, involving a translation of Luther's catechism into Algonquian in 1696. There were tensions between Lutheran Orthodoxy, the austere product of theologians working in the wake of the works of Luther and Melancthon and their subsequent reception in the Book of Concord, and by later scholars, and emerging pietism, under the influence, in particular, of Philipp Spener and his work, *Pia Desideria*. The latter was bound to appeal to many who wanted a religion that both expressed devotion to God and practical Christian service-its appeal was similar to that of early Methodism in England in the next century, though that is not a point that Lohrmann makes. The emphasis on small group meetings for Bible study was perhaps bound to be seen as disruptive to traditional church life, but the 'conventicles', as they were called, had an enduring appeal and, later were to spread to the Nordic countries, where, sometimes, they separated from the parent Lutheran churches.

Lohrmann, in this chapter, also introduces the reader to a particularly significant character for the future development of Lutheran relationships with other communions, Johannes Gerhard, who, in the midst of the disruptive Thirty Years' War, managed to act as a sort of proto, pre-ecumenist, pointing to the shared roots of both Catholic and Lutheran theology and arguing that 'there is much that is Christian and good under the papacy; indeed everything that is Christian and good is found there and has come to us from that source'.

Unsurprisingly, at such a time of conflict, Gerhard's irenic approach did not result in further dialogue but in the resumption, at the Peace of Westphalia, of the existing divisions in Germany.

The period 1717-1817 saw three key developments, the first permanent settlements by Lutherans in North America, the continuation of the Great Lutheran musical tradition, culminating in the work of Bach, who both studied and taught Lutheran Orthodoxy alongside all his musical achievements, and the beginnings of Enlightenment thought as an influence on Lutherans.

It is one of the key glories of Lutheranism, in my opinion, that it preserved so much in Baroque style and musical tradition that was repudiated and discontinued by other Protestants, including the Church of England up till the nineteenth century.

Lohrmann carefully charts the arrival of Lutheran refugees from Salzburg in Georgia in 1734. They, and other, later Lutheran immigrants, faced the problem of developing church life in a new context where there were no longer official church orders, sanctioned by state authority. Lutherans had to learn how to live in a religiously diverse culture and how to continue to live out those traditions that they had inherited in a strange land. Pastor Peter Muhlenberg took the initiative in establishing a ministerium that could keep ministers and congregations more widely accountable and, in particular, could examine and approve those who believed they had a call to ministry, this being in line with Article 14 of the Augsburg Confession, which laid down that no one should teach or administer the sacraments 'unless properly called'.

Finally, the arrival of the Enlightenment, particularly through the influence of Immanuel Kant and the Friedrich Schleiermacher, began the liberalisation of Lutheran theology through a deeper appreciation of the forces of changing philosophies and historical scholarship on the development of all forms of religion.

This was, of course, more generally across the Christian world, to introduce divergence between those who continued to take a pre-critical and eventually fundamentalistic approach to biblical and religious truth, and those who could cope with a more liberal reinterpretation of the varying traditions. In Lutheranism, it was to lead, ultimately, to the divergence between the Lutheran World Federation churches and the International Lutheran Council churches, which continued to affirm the inerrancy of Scripture and to endorse, within that context, the particular traditions of the early Lutheran fathers. It would have been interesting to learn about how the ILC churches are able to defend their stress on the co-ordinate authority of the Lutheran sources they acknowledge alongside their stress on the infallibility and inerrancy of the Scriptures when they are questioned by other conservative evangelical scriptural literalists, formed in rival traditions.

The fourth Lutheran century records many developments that can be paralleled in other Christian confessions. There was a huge expansion of missionary work, some of it in countries not under European colonial government, such as Ethiopia (today one of the largest Lutheran churches) and Madagascar, where missions predated French colonial rule. The development of the Industrial Revolution in Germany prompted the creation of the first Lutheran deaconess community, imitated later in Lutheran Scandinavia and also in Britain, in the formation of the Wesley Deaconess Order in Methodism and an Anglican deaconess order.

A key Prussian development was the union of the Reformed and Lutheran communities in Prussia under the influence of King Friedrich-William III. This provoked mixed reactions. Some accepted it; others felt inclined to resist and re-emphasised the particularities of their own Lutheran and Reformed traditions. The ultimate outcome, in the following century was the EKD, the Evangelical Church of Germany, with its federal structure and its various participating landeskirche, some Lutheran, some Reformed, some United. Some Lutherans, in reaction, departed for America and formed the basis for the Missouri Synod Church.

Important developments took place in worship. Lohrmann relates how pietistic influence led to worship services that centred on bible readings and moralistic sermons rather than the eucharist, to the extent that weekly communions became rare. In reaction to this, some revisited the sources of early Lutheran worship and, indeed, of worship pre-Reformation, both Catholic and Orthodox.

Lohrmann interestingly relates how both high church Anglicans and evangelicals in Victorian times tried to use the authority of Luther to justify their particular liturgical views.

The fifth Lutheran century was to see an increasingly important stress on liturgical reform as both Scandinavian and US Lutheranism in particular produced great liturgical scholars. It was also a century in which global influences and vastly improved means of communication produced comparable changes across a raft of communions, first the main Protestant communions, then, at and after Vatican II, in the Roman Catholic Church. Key developments in Lutheranism included the increasing acceptance of women's ordained ministry, Denmark being in the forefront in 1948, later followed by most other national churches. There was increasing concern to practice holistic mission in third world countries, accompanied, particularly from the 1960's, by the creation of independent autonomous churches, no longer under missionary authority but self-governing (this often followed political independence from colonial powers-thus Tanganyika received political independence in 1961, followed by the Lutheran Church of Tanzania in 1963, now one of the largest Lutheran churches in the world). Increasing stress was placed on the necessary unity of justification and justice, as links were made, in Latin America and elsewhere, with developing liberation theology. Linked to this also was the decision to make the condemnation of racism and apartheid a matter of status confessionis and even to suspend two churches, that were reluctant to change, from LWF membership.

The creation of the Lutheran World Fellowship in 1947 followed from the recognition of the need for Lutherans world-wide to develop a common response to the Ecumenical Movement and the other concerns of a divided world. The LWF responded to the ecumenical development of the ecclesiology of communion by constituting itself precisely as a communion, the decision buttressed later by the publication of a remarkable series of studies, *The Church as Communion*, issued in 1997.

I said at the beginning of this review that I felt Pastor Lohrmann had rather under-emphasised the contribution of Lutherans to the Ecumenical Movement. He gives due prominence to the formative role of Archbishop Soderblom in the 1920's and to recent accords and co-operation with Roman Catholics-particularly the achievement of the Joint Declaration on Justification of 1999 and the remarkable 2016 service, involving Pope Francis, who has a great regard and affection for Lutherans, and the current archbishop of Uppsala. He could also have stressed that the Joint Declaration on Justification has given a lead to three others to accept it, first Methodists, then, in 2018, Anglicans and Reformed. Further, he could emphasise the importance laid by the 1977 Assembly of the LWF on unity in diversity, which harvested, to use Cardinal Kasper's phrase, fruit from the Augsburg Confession's statement of 1530 that, provided Word and Sacrament were duly celebrated, particular customs in worship and fellowship could duly vary within a broader unity.

Particularly important also has been the sheer profundity and thoroughness of the Lutheran contribution to dialogue at both national and international dialogue, particularly with Catholics. Pastor Lohrmann could also, with justifiable pride, cite the real achievement of his own particular church, The ELCA, in making six finely honed full communion agreements with churches of four other Christian communions. He could also mention the formation of the Porvoo Communion in northern Europe, involving British and Irish Anglicans and most Scandinavian and Baltic Lutherans.

Lohrmann concludes by expressing the hope for the sixth century of global Lutheranism, now under way, that I cited at the beginning of this review. Such a hope should inspire the whole oikoumene.

David Carter

www.ecumenicalstudies.org