

Philip Culbertson
The School of Theology
The University of the South
Sewanee, Tennessee 37375
April, 1987

ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE AND THE AUTHORITY OF THE CANON

The thesis of this brief paper: the tension between contemporary Biblical criticism and hermeneutics, particularly in light of the Holocaust, vs. Ecclesiastical tradition and discipline, can be resolved by appropriate resort to Anglican tradition, though such a resolution flies in the face of current developments in simplistic popular theology. The proposed resolution will allow us to continue to refer to the Biblical canon as "The Word of God," in spite of the twin sins of Biblical literalism and Christian super^Scessionism. In particular this brief is a response to "Biblical Authority: Canon, Tradition, and Hermeneutics" by John Townsend.

As an Episcopal priest under vows of ecclesiastical discipline, I find myself troubled by the conclusions of Townsend's paper. My problem might be stated as follows:

Though I am required to say "The Word of God" after many Scripture readings,

Am I even able to say "The Word of God"?

And if I do manage to say "The Word of God"

What do I mean when I say "The Word of God"?

Even more specifically, is it possible for me as a child of God and a pastor to acclaim "The Word of God" in response to Scriptural passages which are expressions of anti-Judaism or, to quote Carter Heyward, of patriarchal heterosexism?(1)

As an Episcopal priest, I live and work under the Oath of Conformity as a critical part of my denominational discipline. At my ordinations to both the diaconate and the priesthood, I was required to swear both orally and in writing: "I solemnly declare that I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation; and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Episcopal Church."(2) I admit that in the enthusiasm of finishing my seminary education and securing my long-anticipated ordination, and prior to my continuing education in Biblical criticism and in Jewish studies, I did not examine closely the ramifications of such an oath. I could plead that the vow is not binding, in that I did not understand the oath that I took.(3) However, in order to continue as a priest, I am required to be under some sort of vow, and the church provides no alternative wording to the above. Ethically I cannot continue as a priest and yet totally ignore the vows and discipline to which I am voluntarily sworn. My only choices would appear to be 1) conscious disobedience to church discipline based on the principle of higher good (this is not to ignore my vows, for I cannot be disobedient without first recognizing their binding intent), or 2) searching Anglican tradition for an understanding of the vows and wording which will allow

me to continue to affirm the authority of the Scriptural Canon in spite of its apparent anti-Judaism and patriarchal heterosexism.

The first option is not an attractive one. The Church already has enough lack of discipline and blatant disobedience for anyone to justifiably encourage more. For disobedience to retain its cutting edge, it needs to be proclaimed repeatedly, which I do not understand to be appropriate to liturgical structure, nor indeed, a correct use of liturgy. In many cases, liturgy conducted as an act of obedience makes a stronger political statement than liturgy conducted as an act of disobedience; I would not want to rob liturgy of its power as a political statement by necessitating a running commentary of ecclesiastical disobedience right within its very conduct. The second option is then left me: of reaching inside Anglican tradition for help and understanding. Six areas of inquiry suggest a beginning:

1. What authority does Scripture have for Anglicans?
2. What is meant by "canon" in Anglican terminology?
3. How is authority distributed through the canon?
4. How binding is the Prayer Book lectionary?
5. How binding is the Oath of Conformity?
6. What do Anglicans mean when they say "The Word of God"?

What authority does Scripture have for Anglicans?

Anglicanism understands itself as resting upon a three-legged stool, those legs being Scripture, Tradition, and Reason. But each of these three

"legs" is itself subject to abusive interpretation and misunderstanding, so that much of specifically-Anglican theology has been a spelling out of what is meant by the terms, how they inform each other, and how they are carried on in the contemporary practice of Anglicanism. One such spelling out occurred between the two World Wars, when in 1922 Archbishop of Canterbury Randall Davidson and Archbishop of York Cosmo Gordon Lang convened a Commission on Christian Doctrine, chaired by William Temple, to conduct a fifteen-year series of meetings in which the specifics of Anglican doctrine were spelled out in order partly to quell charges of heresy between competing theological groups in the British church.

According to the published final report, Scripture has authority in that we derive all doctrine from it and measure all truth by it, constantly tempered by tradition and informed by reason. However, the Bible may not be used as the sole source of authority in Anglicanism, nor may it be used incorrectly, for as a source of teaching it is subject to four additional considerations:

- 1) The authority ascribed to the Bible must not be interpreted as prejudging the conclusions of historical, critical and scientific investigation in any field, not excluding that of the Biblical documents themselves.
- 2) Christian thinkers are not necessarily bound to the thought-forms employed by the Biblical writers.
- 3) The Biblical writings display a wide variety of literary type. In

using the Biblical books as a standard of authoritative teaching, these facts must be taken into account. The supreme spiritual value of some parts of the Bible is not shared by all.

- 4) In estimating the relative spiritual value of different portions of the Bible, the standard is the Mind of Christ as unfolded in the experience of the Church and appropriated by the individual Christian through His Spirit. That is to say, the stages of the Biblical revelation are to be judged in relation to its historical climax.(5)

Of particular importance here is number 1, which insists on the use of critical scholarship as an integral part of the authority of Scripture (that is, the use of reason), and number ³/~~4~~, which insists that tradition informs and determines the right use of Scripture. Anglicanism does not espouse the doctrine of sola scriptura, nor of Biblical literalism, nor has it even sustained evangelicalism for long periods of time in its history. In typical fashion of the Anglican via media, Scripture is neither to be too downplayed, nor praised too highly: "Whatsoever is spoken of God or things appertaining to God otherwise than as the truth is, though it seem an honour, it is an injury. And as incredible praises given unto men do often abate and impair the credit of their deserved commendation, so we must likewise take great heed, lest in attributing unto Scripture more than it can have, the incredibility of that do cause even those things which indeed it hath most abundantly to be less reverently esteemed," writes Anglican Divine Richard Hooker.(6) Scripture is intended by God to be only one leg of the three-legged stool; otherwise it becomes both distorted and distrustable.

What is meant by "Canon" in Anglican terminology?

According to the prayer book Catechism, "The Holy Scriptures, commonly called the Bible, are the books of the Old and New Testaments; other books, called the Apocrypha, are often included in the Bible ... The Old Testament consists of books written by the people of the Old Covenant, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, to show God at work in nature and history ... The New Testament consists of books written by the people of the New Covenant, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, to set forth the life and teachings of Jesus and to proclaim the Good News of the Kingdom for all people." (7) The Catechism definition is still quite vague, given that the canon was not set until Trent (8), and given that the canon varies so significantly from denomination to denomination, and from one branch of Christendom to the next. (9)

The Anglican canon consists of "the Old Testament" (more properly termed The Hebrew Scriptures in recent Anglican tradition), the Apocrypha and the New Testament, though of course even these three terms are vague in the history of the canon. Doctrine may be derived from the Old Testament and the New Testament, but may not be derived from the Apocrypha: the Apocrypha is read "for example of life and instruction of manners." (10) The Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion--written in sixteenth century England in order to promote Anglican unity in the face of Roman Catholicism on the one side and Anabaptism on the other--were adopted in 1801 by the American church as "expressing the faith of

the church," but were never made binding upon American clergy as they are binding upon English clergy; the assumption of the American Church is that the 39 Articles are the point of reference in the word "doctrine" in the Oath of Conformity. Article VI of the 39 Articles lists the canonical books of the Old Testament "of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church:"(11) the list includes I and II Esdras (presumably Ezra and Nehemiah), "four Prophets the greater" (presumably Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel), "twelve Prophets the less,"(12) but appears to omit the Book of Lamentations, unless it is assumed under the title of Jeremiah. The contents listed for the Apocrypha conform to the present Oxford Annotated RSV, with the exception of The Letter of Jeremiah, unless that letter is assumed as a part of the Book of Baruch. The New Testament is defined as including those books which are "commonly received."(13) Clearly "canon" in Anglican tradition has a Western Protestant definition, with the Apocrypha included but with diminished authority.

How is authority distributed through the Scriptures?

Anglican tradition holds that the spiritual value of the Scriptures is not evenly distributed throughout them.(14) The Gospels have always held a primary position of honor, though this is not to imply, since at least the 16th century's 39 Articles, that the Hebrew Scriptures are in any way dispensable either for the purposes of deriving doctrine or for securing salvation. The 39 Articles further imply that authority is not evenly distributed throughout Scriptures by distinguishing in the Hebrew Scriptures between moral

codes, which remain binding upon all Christians, and ceremonial or ritual codes, which are not binding.(15)

But even the Gospels are not consistently authoritative. The authority of the New Testament is available to us only through the eyes of the most contemporary advanced Biblical criticism. As the Commission on Christian Doctrine observed: "In accepting the authority of (Jesus') recorded teaching the following considerations must be borne in mind:

- 1) The actual teaching itself was called forth by particular occasions and was conditioned by the thought-forms and circumstances of the time.
- 2) The record cannot be accepted as always reproducing the ipsissima verba of our Lord.

"In the latter connexion the following points may be mentioned:

- a) In any case, the words spoken have been translated into another language.
- b) The occasions with regard to which the teaching was originally given are not always set forth.
- c) There is some reason to think that in some cases the words attributed to our Lord reflect rather the experience of the primitive Church, or the utterances of Christian prophets, than actual words of Jesus.
- d) What appear to be the same sayings are sometimes recorded in different forms and contexts.

"It follows from what has been said above that the method of direct appeal to isolated texts in our Lord's teaching, in so far as it ignores the controlling considerations which have been set forth, is liable to error."(16) Thus we may deduce that Anglican tradition holds authority to be unevenly distributed through the canon, both within the Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament, so that it may even be said that some portions of the Hebrew Scriptures have more authority than some portions of the New Testament. Anglican tradition further forbids "proof-texting," in that it leads to attributing authority where it cannot properly be claimed.

The first evidence of some special place of honor being attributed to the Gospel is found in The Apostolic Constitutions, c. 380 CE, wherein people are required to stand for the reading of the Gospel (it can therefore be assumed that many people sat during the Gospel reading up until that time, thus supporting Townsend's claim that prior to Marcion, "certain Christian writings might be read at Christian worship much in the same way that Christian Scientists will add a reading from Mary Baker Eddy's Science and Health"(17)). The Apostolic Constitutions also reserve for the first time the public reading of the Gospels to the ordained. There appears to be no sort of declamatory response following the Gospel until the 7th or 8th century CE, and even then the acclamation was one of praise, rather than one designed to suggest the inerrancy of Biblical literalism. Only with the 1979 Book of Common Prayer does the phrase "The Word of the Lord" or "The Gospel of the Lord" enter the liturgy as a possible response to readings from Scripture; until this late date, Anglican liturgical tradition does not consider such responses appropriate.(18) This contemporary fashion of response to readings from Scripture

unfortunately serves to destroy the cherished Anglican balance between Scripture, Tradition and Reason by suggesting to the uninformed an exaggerated emphasis on Scripture.

How binding is the lectionary?

Most Episcopalians are remarkably ignorant of Scripture: this should come as no surprise, since most American Christians are also remarkably ignorant of Scripture. What Episcopalians do know about Scripture, they know for the most part from the weekly lectionary (as opposed to the daily lectionary, which is less widely used).(19) For each Sunday and red-letter day, the lectionary normally provides a lesson from the Hebrew Scriptures (or occasionally from the Apocrypha) and two lessons from the New Testament--Epistle and Gospel.

For Episcopal clergy, prayer book rubrics carry the binding authority of canon law. "Violation of the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer" is an offense for which a clergyperson is liable for presentment and trial before an ecclesiastical court, with the possible result of deposition.(20) Prayer Book rubrics require the use of one or two lessons, plus a Gospel, at all main Sunday celebrations of the Eucharist.(21) The "Old Testament Lesson" is not required, though encouraged by liturgical educators. Unfortunately, it remains the practice of many Episcopal priests to omit that particular lesson; bad theology is justified by citing an assumed desire on the part of lay people for short services.

It is not true that all major Western denominations use the same lectionary. The title "Common Lectionary" is misleading; from denomination to denomination, the lectionary is similar, but not identical. Individual denominations have made changes in the lectionary to suit their own theological perceptions. For example, though most lections remain common, in certain cases the Roman lectionary emphasizes lessons which could be interpreted to discourage birth control, while the Episcopal lectionary omits several passages referring to homosexuality.

It may be argued that a lectionary functions as a canon within a canon; at the very least it is an expression of what one ecclesiastical body deems necessary to be heard in settings of public worship, and a clear decision "from on high" of where authority lies within the canon and where it does not. If Townsend is correct in describing the canon as a broad range of choices from which we are encouraged to make appropriate selections, it might be argued that the lectionary deprives the faithful of such a choice, encouraging Scriptural ignorance and passive dependence in that the laity are not allowed to engage the Biblical text enough to determine for themselves that has authority and what does not. In particular this is the case with the appointed readings from the Hebrew Scriptures; they are almost always selections from those Prophetic materials which Christian triumphalism has used in support of ^Ssupercessionism. At very least the Holocaust must challenge the church to re-examine the dangerous theology of ^Ssupercessionism implicit in the lectionary.

Rubrically, appointed lections may not be substituted with other lessons, nor may any appointed lesson be shortened; it may only be lengthened. Only

specific translations of the Bible are allowed for public reading;(22) thus far no inclusive language translation has been approved, nor is it within the bounds of canon to tone down the anti-Judaism of a passage by using an unauthorized new translation. The only legal method by which lessons may be substituted is by designating a service as being Rite III,(23) in which any number of readings may be used from a variety of Scriptural and non-Scriptural sources, as long as one lesson is taken from a Gospel. This need not be the Gospel appointed for the Sunday by the lectionary, nor need the Gospel be placed as the last reading in the public sequence.(24) No acclamation such as "The Word of the Lord" is required following lessons used in Rite III.

How binding is the Oath of Conformity

An ordained person may be deposed from orders on the grounds of "any act which includes a violation of his (her) ordination vows" or for "violation of the Constitution and Canons of the General Convention".(25) These vows, the Oath of Conformity, have been required at ordination in the American church since 1789, though the word "Discipline" was added to the vow only in 1901.(26) Historians of the canons agree that the original intention of the Oath was to bring into line those layreaders who were operating in the clergy vacuum created by the American Revolution. Thus the Oath was originally designed to bring conformity to lay leaders of worship in a difficult period of Episcopalian history. The continuing use of some sort of vow in the process of ordination is certainly justifiable, as an ordering of the life of a community which has always felt the temptation of congregationalism in its

church polity; what must not be assumed is that the present Oath necessarily conveys the best theology in its specific wording.

What do Anglicans mean when they say "The Word of the Lord"?

It should be noted that rubrically this phrase "The Word of the Lord," or "The Word of God" is not required after the reading of a lesson from the Hebrew Scriptures or the New Testament epistles: a lesson may as well have no concluding acclamation, or it may end with the declaration "Here ends the reading".(27) The Book of Common Prayer appoints that people will sit for all lessons except the Gospel, though it would seem that a case could be made for standing for the Hebrew Scripture lesson, out of respect for the Scriptures cherished by Jesus and the Jerusalem Church. The phrase which Townsend challenges is thus not obligatory within this part of the liturgy. The Gospel is introduced, all standing, with the required formula "The Holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ according to _____,"(28) to which the people respond "Glory to you, Lord Christ". Following the Gospel the reader says "The Gospel of the Lord," (added 1979), to which the people respond "Praise to you, Lord Christ" (added 1928). Hatchett points out that the distinction between the Methodist formula, "This is the Gospel of the Lord" vs. the Anglican formula "The Gospel of the Lord"; the Methodist formula appears to imply that this and only this is the Gospel, and that the Gospel exists nowhere else apart from the canonical New Testament evangelists. He understands the Anglican formula to be broader in scope, having the sense of an acclamation declaiming "We have heard good news!" The problem is not resolved

by this suggestion, for it is still impossible in good conscience to proclaim as Good News a small but significant portion of the appointed Gospel lections, particularly when they promote anti-Judaism or patriarchal heterosexism, or for that matter encourage violence toward or discrimination against any of God's creatures.

Townsend raises the question whether "The Word of God" means "The Word from God" or "The Word about God." (29) "The Word from God" encourages a sense of inerrancy and literalism; "The Word about God" implies that these are human words, spoken in historically conditioned contexts, and thus ever open to interpretation and even to correction. This latter definition is supported not only by the Commission on Christian Doctrine (30) but also by the Book of Common Prayer Catechism: "We call (the Holy Scriptures) the Word of God because God inspired their human authors and because God still speaks to us through the Bible" (31)--which I understand to be carefully worded so as to discourage literalism, inerrancy, and Bibliolatry by emphasizing the human element of transmission and reception.

The phrase "The Word of the Lord" is Scriptural; dabbar adonai or divrei adonai appears in the Hebrew Scriptures somewhat less than twenty times, and is confined almost exclusively to the prophetic materials. Here some revelation originates with God, but is clearly filtered through human agents who are faltering, who are insecure, and whom history shows to have misunderstood or miscommunicated, as Townsend observes in relation to Jeremiah 26:18. (32) Herein lies the Anglican understanding of the phrase "The Word of God" or "The Word of the Lord": a revelation originating with God in some manner, open

equally to human comprehension or miscomprehension, culturally conditioned, subject to higher criticism, and empowering only in so far as we allow it to become alive again in our own generation and situation. Only within this definition can I as a priest live with my ordination vow that "I believe the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God."

Contra Townsend, with love!

Townsend closes his article with three suggestions:

- 1) That we stop calling Scripture "The Word of God". I have shown that this is not a viable option for those under Episcopal discipline.
- 2) That we should encourage the use of written or oral commentary in conjunction with Scripture. As I have written elsewhere, (33) homilies come after the lessons, and thus are little more than an effort to shut the barn door after the horse has run away. Commentaries accessible to laypersons are so remarkably ignorant of progressive Biblical scholarship that I hesitate to recommend them, and as in the case of William Barclay's extremely popular commentaries, are full of anti-Judaism and patriarchal heterosexism; one obvious exception is the work of Walter ^{BRUGEMANN} Brueggemann, written in a manner which appeals greatly to lay people, yet based on fine scholarship.
- 3) That particularly difficult Scripture passages should be omitted from the Sunday lectionary. Townsend cites two examples, neither of which is an allowable omission in the lectionary: Matthew 27:25 on Palm Sunday, and

John 14:6b in Eastertide A. Episcopal clergy are presently as bound by the lectionary as they are by the discipline of canon law.

Instead of Townsend's three suggestions, I would like to offer six of my own, more suited to the present discipline of the Anglican communion:

- 1) We need to teach much more aggressively the Anglican understanding of the authority of Scripture. All revelation is in some sense the Word of God, the dabbar adonai. One, but only one, vehicle for that revelation is scripture, but as Townsend correctly points out, scripture presents us a broad range of possibilities, not all of which are equally authoritative, nor as I have argued is the New Testament necessarily always more authoritative than the Hebrew Scriptures, in spite of its honored place in Christian tradition. All scripture, no matter the source, is subject to the same sense of fallibility as are all other forms and methods of human transmission and interpretation of God's revelation, including as well tradition and reason. In particular we need to make clear that the anti-Judaism of the New Testament is a tragic human distortion of God's will, as is proven by the history of Christian violence against Jews based upon historically inaccurate information and exegesis. Anglicanism does not rest upon the concepts of scriptural inerrancy and literalism; those who so teach, or who proof-text in such manner, have removed themselves from Anglican tradition.
- 2) We need to help Anglicans understand that there is no such thing as a Christian canon, but only denominational canons which come relatively late in Christian history. The implication argues once again against

literalism, as well as emphasizing the centrality of the Hebrew canon as norma normans.(35) There is no such thing as an inerrant Word of God which exists between two book covers for all Christians.

- 3) We need to lobby for alterations to the Prayer Book so that Hebrew Scripture readings presently appointed by the lectionary become required rubrically in Sunday worship. Seminary education has not yet accomplished the task of convincing ordinands that the Hebrew Scriptures are the indispensable foundation for understanding the New Testament.
- 4) We need as well to lobby for changes in the lectionary and for the approval of new authorized translations of scripture. Since lectionary changes have already been accomplished on a denominational level, rather than a "common" interdenominational level, further changes are justifiable without waiting for broad Christian ^Sconsensus. We need as well to lobby for the passage of the resolution to be presented at General Convention 1988, calling for the addition to the Episcopal calendar of a Holocaust Remembrance Day. In the meantime, we can, by designating all non-Sunday-principal Eucharists as Rite III, play with the form of Lesson, Epistle and Gospel, altering their order and making substitutions. We can cut-and-paste sentences from various authorized translations to produce texts with a minimum of anti-Judaism and sexism. We can expose Anglicans to a broader range of the scriptural choices through alternative services and religious education.
- 5) We can educate our clergy that ecclesiastical discipline assumes the tension between disobedience for a higher good vs. creative exegesis and re-interpretation. Disobedience is not the correct and responsible choice

until the possibilities of re-interpretation have been exhausted. To say that "the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God" is not intended to be a vow of inerrancy or literalism, for such interpretation contradicts the history of Anglican theology and tradition.

- 6) We can avoid using "The Word of the Lord" following all readings where an alternative is provided. There are indeed ways to understand the phrase correctly, but it remains misleading for many. We cannot change the Oath without the cooperation of General Convention, but we can do a better job of teaching ordinands what it means.

The issues around the authority of scripture in Christian tradition following the Holocaust are not solved by abandoning, or even denying, the entire two thousand years of Christian tradition. Change is encouraged through a clear sense of Christian identity, particularly in relation to the religious pluralism of God's revelation, and through a re-capturing of important theological elements that have been in our tradition all along, though fleetingly lost sight of. Whatever credibility we might have as agitators for change in the Christian community, as confronters of what Rosemary Reuther has called "the left hand of Christology," we have such credibility from within, by the continuation of our ecclesiastical discipline as the chosen context from within which we ask the questions which discomfit the church comfortable.

NOTES

1. Carter Heyward, "Enforcing Male Supremacy." The Witness, Vol. 69, No. 4, April 1986.

2. 1979 Book of Common Prayer, pp. 513, 536, 538; Constitution and Canons 1985, Article II, pp. 6-7 and Title III, Canon 9, p. 71 and Canon 10, p. 74.
3. Reference Constitution and Canons 1985, Title I, Canon 18, section 2, page 49, and the grounds for the dissolution of a marriage in Title I, Canon 19, section 2, p. 50.
4. Doctrine in the Church of England: The Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938.
5. Doctrine in the Church, p. 32.
6. Richard Hooker, Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, edited by A. S. McGrade and Brian Vickers. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975, p. 184.
7. 1979 Book of Common Prayer, p. 853.
8. John Townsend, "Biblical Authority: Canon, Tradition and Hermeneutics," p. 4.
9. See, for instance, The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, edited by James H. Charlesworth, Volume I, pp. xxiii-xxiv, article on "Canon". Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1983.
10. Article VI of the "Articles of Religion," 1979 Book of Common Prayer, p. 868.
11. Ibid.
12. This division appears to be peculiarly Anglican; it does not conform to Jewish tradition, nor to the divisions accepted in Biblical criticism.
13. Townsend (pp. 3-4, note 6) suggests that Cranmer ignored Revelation as part of the New Testament canon. While Cranmer did omit Revelation from

the daily lectionary, he appointed its use for red-letter days, including St. Michael's, Holy Innocents, and All Saints'. In general, according to Marion Hatchett, Cranmer ignored both Ezekiel and Revelation because of his intense dislike of apocalyptic literature.

14. Doctrine in the Church, p. 32. The same may be said of the Lutheran tradition. Luther said "The Bible isn't the Word of God. The Word of God is Jesus Christ and the Bible is the manger in which the baby lies. And there was some straw in the manger, too." (Martin Marty quoting Roland Bainton quoting Martin Luther, in Context, October 1, 1981, p. 6.)
15. 1979 Book of Common Prayer, Article VII, p. 869.
16. Doctrine in the Church, pp. 32-33.
17. Townsend, pp. 5-6.
18. While the Gloria Tibi exists as a rubrically required introduction to the Gospel in the earliest American prayer book, the Laus Tibi is not added until the 1928 prayer book, and "The Gospel of the Lord" not until the 1979 book.
19. The weekly lectionary, in a three year cycle, is found in the Book of Common Prayer, pp. 889-931.
20. Constitution and Canons 1985, Title IV, Canon 1, section 1, p. 111. This ground for presentment was added to the canons in 1904.
21. Book of Common Prayer, p. 357.
22. Constitution and Canons 1985, Title II, Canon 2, p. 53.
23. 1979 Book of Common Prayer, p. 400.
24. Rite III may not be used as the principal service of worship on Sundays.

25. Constitution and Canons 1985, Title IV, Canon 1, section 1, p. 111. The former clause was added in 1868, the latter clause in 1832.
26. Discipline is understood to derive from five sources: the Constitution and Canons, the Book of Common Prayer, the Hymnal, Diocesan canons, and the Bishop. The Oath of Conformity is repeated at each of a person's ordinations: diaconate, priesthood, and episcopacy.
27. 1979 Book of Common Prayer, p. 357. See above note 18: the phrase "The Word of the Lord" has no precedent of tradition in Episcopal prayer books. Marion Hatchett (Commentary on the American Prayer Book, New York: Seabury, 1980, p. 327) writes that the phrase is adopted in 1979 from the Roman sacramentary of Paul VI.
28. The formula is already required in the 1549 Book of Common Prayer (Hatchett, p. 331).
29. Townsend, p. 1-2.
30. See notes 4 and 5, and the text thereto.
31. 1979 Book of Common Prayer, p. 853.
32. Townsend, p. 2.
33. Philip Culbertson, "Preaching the Gospel of the Incarnate Pharisee," Religious Education, Vol. 79, No. 2, Spring 1984.
34. I note here Townsend's fine translation of the Passion account, even published by an Episcopal publishing house (Forward Movement Press), but which does not qualify under Title III, Canon 2 as an allowable translation, and thus is usable only for Rite III, i.e., not for a principal Sunday service.
35. See Clark Williamson, "The Authority of the Scripture after the Shoah," unpublished manuscript.