

## No. VIII.

### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE † APPOINTED TO CONSIDER RELATION TO AND REUNION WITH OTHER CHURCHES—(a) EPISCOPAL CHURCHES; (b) NON-EPISCOPAL CHURCHES, WITH QUESTIONS AS TO (i) RECOGNITION OF MINISTERS; (ii) "VALIDITY" OF SACRAMENTS; (iii) SUGGESTED TRANSITIONAL STEPS.

THE Committee appointed to consider and report upon relation to and reunion with other Churches divided itself into two sub-committees dealing with the two main divisions of the subject submitted for their consideration, namely (a) Episcopal Churches, and (b) Non-Episcopal Churches. Of these two sub-committees, the former was presided over by the Bishop of Gloucester, and the second by the chairman of the whole Committee.

The whole Committee is responsible for the first part of the Report, including the Appeal, and Resolutions which follow this part. Each Sub-Committee is responsible for its own Report and for the Resolutions founded upon it.

#### † Names of Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Aberdeen	Bishop of Hankow
Archbishop of Algoma	Bishop of Harrisburg (a)
Bishop of Argyll (a)	Bishop in Jerusalem (a) ( <i>Secretary</i> )
Archbishop of Armagh	Bishop Johnson (Missouri Coadjutor)
Bishop of Atlanta	Bishop Joscelyne
Bishop of Bath and Wells*	Bishop in Khartoum (a)
Bishop Hamilton Baynes	Bishop King (a)
Bishop of Bethlehem	Bishop of Kootenay
Bishop of Bombay ( <i>Secretary</i> )	Bishop of Kyushu
Bishop of Brechin (Primus)	Bishop of Madras
Archbishop of Brisbane	Bishop of Manchester
Bishop of Bristol ( <i>Secretary</i> )	Bishop of Massachusetts
Bishop of Chelmsford	Bishop of Meath
Bishop of Chichester	Archbishop of Melbourne
Bishop of Columbia	Bishop of Mombasa
Bishop of Derby	Bishop of Montreal
Bishop of Derry	Bishop of Moray and Ross (a)
Bishop of Dornakal	Bishop of Nassau
Bishop of Down	Bishop of Norwich
Bishop Du Moulin (Ohio Coadjutor)	Bishop of Olympia
Bishop of Durham	Bishop of Ontario
Bishop of Ely	Bishop of Pennsylvania
Bishop of Gibraltar (a)	Bishop of Peterborough
Bishop of Gloucester (a)	Bishop of Pretoria

(a) Members of Sub-Committee on Episcopal Churches. The remainder formed the Sub-Committee on Non-Episcopal Churches.

## PART I.

## REPORT OF THE WHOLE COMMITTEE.

The reunion of the separated congregations of Christ's flock is fundamental to all the subjects dealt with by the Lambeth Conference. For the manifold witness of the Church would be intensified and extended beyond all measure if it came from an undivided Society of Jesus Christ. To restore the unity of this Society, therefore, would be to increase the effective force of this witness in every part of the world to a degree which in these days can be scarcely imagined. No one who is not blind to the signs which abound on every hand can doubt that the Spirit of God is moving in this direction in a way which must bring home to the authorities of all Christian Communions a deep sense of responsibility in the face of an opportunity which is almost without parallel in the history of the Church. It was with a full, and indeed an overwhelming, sense of this responsibility that the members of this Committee entered upon the task committed to it. In spite of the differences of opinion which we brought with us to the consideration of our subject we seemed to be guided towards an ideal of Christian unity which we have endeavoured to express in the Appeal which we place in the forefront of our resolutions. It appeared to us that we could best fulfil the duty laid upon us at this present time by placing this ideal before all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, in the hope that, if it be in accordance with God's will, it may by His blessing serve to inspire and guide a new and united movement towards the fulfilment of His purpose for the unity of His Church.

Names of Members of the Committee—*continued*.

Archbishop of Rupert's Land	Bishop in Tinnevely
Bishop of St. Albans	Bishop of Truro (a) ( <i>Secretary</i> )
Bishop of St. Andrews	Bishop of Uganda
Bishop of St. David's	Bishop of Waiapu
Bishop of St. John's (a)	Bishop of Warrington
Bishop of Salisbury	Bishop of Western New York
Bishop of Southern Brazil	Bishop of Willesden (a)
Bishop of South Carolina	Bishop Mott Williams* (a)
Bishop of Southern Ohio (a)	Bishop of Willochra
Bishop in South Tokyo	Bishop of Winchester
Archbishop of Sydney	Archbishop of York ( <i>Chairman</i> )
Bishop of Tennessee	Bishop of Zanzibar

(a) Members of Sub-Committee on Episcopal Churches. The remainder formed the Sub-Committee on Non-Episcopal Churches.

We therefore venture to recommend that the Conference should adopt and send forth the following Appeal to all Christian people:

## AN APPEAL TO ALL CHRISTIAN PEOPLE

FROM THE BISHOPS ASSEMBLED IN THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1920.

We, Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England, in Conference assembled, realizing the responsibility which rests upon us at this time, and sensible of the sympathy and the prayers of many, both within and without our own Communion, make this appeal to all Christian people.

We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body. We believe that the Holy Spirit has called us in a very solemn and special manner to associate ourselves in penitence and prayer with all those who deplore the divisions of Christian people, and are inspired by the vision and hope of a visible unity of the whole Church.

I. We believe that God wills fellowship. By God's own act this fellowship was made in and through Jesus Christ, and its life is in His Spirit. We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward, visible, and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognized officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God. This is what we mean by the Catholic Church.

II. This united fellowship is not visible in the world to-day. On the one hand there are other ancient episcopal Communions in East and West, to whom ours is bound by many ties of common faith and tradition. On the other hand there are the great non-episcopal Communions, standing for rich elements of truth, liberty and life which might otherwise have been obscured or neglected. With them we are closely linked by many affinities, racial, historical and spiritual. We cherish the earnest hope that all these Communions, and our own, may be led by the Spirit into the unity of the Faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God. But in fact we are all organized in different groups, each one keeping to itself gifts that rightly belong to the whole fellowship, and tending to live its own life apart from the rest.

III. The causes of division lie deep in the past, and are by no means simple or wholly blameworthy. Yet none can doubt that self-will, ambition, and lack of charity among Christians



have been principal factors in the mingled process, and that these, together with blindness to the sin of disunion, are still mainly responsible for the breaches of Christendom. We acknowledge this condition of broken fellowship to be contrary to God's will, and we desire frankly to confess our share in the guilt of thus crippling the Body of Christ and hindering the activity of His Spirit.

IV. The times call us to a new outlook and new measures. The Faith cannot be adequately apprehended and the battle of the Kingdom cannot be worthily fought while the body is divided, and is thus unable to grow up into the fulness of the life of Christ. The time has come, we believe, for all the separated groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things which are behind and reaching out towards the goal of a reunited Catholic Church. The removal of the barriers which have arisen between them will only be brought about by a new comradeship of those whose faces are definitely set this way.

The vision which rises before us is that of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all "who profess and call themselves Christians," within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ. Within this unity Christian Communion now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled.

V. This means an adventure of goodwill and still more of faith, for nothing less is required than a new discovery of the creative resources of God. To this adventure we are convinced that God is now calling all the members of His Church.

VI. We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of:—

The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief:

The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ:

A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.

VII. May we not reasonably claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry? It is not that we

call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communion which do not possess the Episcopate. On the contrary we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace. But we submit that considerations alike of history and of present experience justify the claim which we make on behalf of the Episcopate. Moreover, we would urge that it is now and will prove to be in the future the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church. But we greatly desire that the office of a Bishop should be everywhere exercised in a representative and constitutional manner, and more truly express all that ought to be involved for the life of the Christian Family in the title of Father-in-God. Nay more, we eagerly look forward to the day when through its acceptance in a united Church we may all share in that grace which is pledged to the members of the whole body in the apostolic rite of the laying-on of hands, and in the joy and fellowship of a Eucharist in which as one Family we may together, without any doubtfulness of mind, offer to the one Lord our worship and service.

VIII. We believe that for all the truly equitable approach to union is by the way of mutual deference to one another's consciences. To this end, we who send forth this appeal would say that if the authorities of other Communion should so desire, we are persuaded that, terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, Bishops and clergy of our Communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life. It is not in our power to know how far this suggestion may be acceptable to those to whom we offer it. We can only say that we offer it in all sincerity as a token of our longing that all ministries of grace, theirs and ours, shall be available for the service of our Lord in a united Church.

It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through episcopal ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship.

In so acting no one of us could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry. God forbid that any man should repudiate a past experience rich in spiritual blessings for himself and others. Nor would any of us be dishonouring the Holy Spirit of God, Whose call led us all to our several ministries, and Whose power enabled us to perform them. We shall be publicly and formally seeking additional recognition of a new call to wider service in a reunited Church, and imploring for ourselves God's grace and strength to fulfil the same.

IX. The spiritual leadership of the Catholic Church in days to come, for which the world is manifestly waiting, depends



upon the readiness with which each group is prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of a common fellowship, a common ministry, and a common service to the world.

We place this ideal first and foremost before ourselves and our own people. We call upon them to make the effort to meet the demands of a new age with a new outlook. To all other Christian people whom our words may reach we make the same appeal. We do not ask that any one Communion should consent to be absorbed in another. We do ask that all should unite in a new and great endeavour to recover and to manifest to the world the unity of the Body of Christ for which He prayed.

The Lambeth Conference of 1908 passed the following resolution (No. 78) "The constituted authorities of the various Churches of the Anglican Communion should, as opportunity offers, arrange conferences with representatives of other Christian Churches, and meetings for common acknowledgement of the sins of division, and for intercession for the growth of unity."

In another part of this Report it is shewn that in many countries, particularly in the United States of America, in India, and in Africa, this course has been very largely followed. But the urgency of the present world situation, and the wide and deep longing for unity which these Conferences have revealed, and which fills the hearts of Christian people throughout the world, seem to us to call for further and more responsible action. We ask the Conference to recommend that the authorities of the Churches of the Anglican Communion should, in such ways and at such times as they think best, formally invite the authorities of other Churches within their areas to confer with them as to the possibility of taking definite steps to co-operate in a common endeavour, on the lines set forth in the Appeal, to restore the unity of the Church of Christ. It may be that these approaches will meet with some rebuffs and disappointments. Special circumstances may be urged as shewing that such conferences would be premature. Some doors seem for the present to be shut. But many doors in all parts of the world are open. There are already movements in progress for a closer union of Communions separated from us and from one another. With the spirit and hopes of these movements we would associate ourselves, heartily desiring their success and trusting that they may forward the cause of the ultimate union of the universal Church. Yet the historical traditions and the spiritual sympathies of the Anglican Church seem to lay upon us a special duty, which at this present time we ought to accept as a definite call of God. May He in His mercy forgive and take from us any spirit of self-satisfaction! We have need frankly to acknowledge and humbly to confess our manifold sins and shortcomings as a Church. In all our approaches to our fellow Christians of other Churches we shall

try to make it plain that we only desire to be permitted to take our part with them in a cause to which the Lord Whom we serve is at this time most manifestly calling all the members of His Church.

Here it will not be out of place to draw the attention of our fellow-churchmen to some important results of the extension and development of the Anglican Communion, and the bearing of these upon the question of reunion and upon our attitude and duty towards it.

At the date of the first Lambeth Conference, 1867, this Communion had taken the form of a federation of self-governing Churches, held together for the most part without legal sanctions by a common reverence for the same traditions and a common use of a Prayer Book which, in spite of some local variations, was virtually the same. Our missionary workers were then planting churches among nations very different from the Anglo-Saxon race and from one another, but as yet these had shewn but little growth. In the interval between that time and the present there have grown up indigenous Churches in China, in Japan, in East and West Africa, in each of which the English members are but a handful of strangers and sojourners, some engaged in missionary work, some in secular business. In India the Church includes large numbers both of British and of Indian members: the emergence of a National Church, claiming freedom to regulate its own affairs, is only a matter of time. Consequently the Anglican Communion of to-day is a federation of Churches, some national, some regional, but no longer predominantly Anglo-Saxon in race, nor can it be expected that it will attach special value to Anglo-Saxon traditions. The blessing which has rested upon its work has brought it to a new point of view. Meanwhile, it might also be said that its centre of gravity is shifting. It already presents an example on a small scale of the problems which attach to the unity of a Universal Church. As the years go on, its ideals must become less Anglican and more Catholic. It cannot look to any bonds of union holding it together, other than those which should hold together the Catholic Church itself.

While this development has been going on, another has kept pace with it. Our Communion has taken into itself, tried, and found valuable many elements which were not to be found in any effective condition in the Church of England one hundred or even fifty years ago. The bearing of these on the problem of reunion is so important that we deem it worth while to notice here some examples. In most parts of our Communion the Episcopate does not even present the appearance of autocracy or prelacy. Various arrangements have been adopted by which the Bishop is elected by the Diocese over which he is to preside. The affairs of the Diocese are managed by the Bishop in conjunction with a Diocesan Synod or Council. The Bishops and



their Dioceses are further correlated in Provincial and General Synods, Conventions or Assemblies. Thus, Episcopacy among us has generally become constitutional, and the clergy and laity have attained to a share in the government of the Church. Again, in many parts of our Communion systems of patronage have been adopted which recognize the right of congregations to take part in the selection of their ministers. We draw attention to these matters as evidencing our recognition, not only in word but in deed, of the value of some of those elements of Church life which those now separated from us have developed with marked success. We would urge further on our own fellow-churchmen that it is one of the most pressing and most important steps towards reunion that they should develop in every place, according to its own circumstances and the genius of its people, the well-tryed principles of constitutionalism in the government of the Church, and of the full employment of every member in its life, and the Committee venture to submit a Resolution to this effect to the Conference.

There are other signs of similar expansion from within, which have made our Communion more representative of the varying phases of Christian life and devotion. The development of mission services and missions of many kinds, the use of various additional forms of prayer, of *ex tempore* prayer, of silent prayer, and again of various kinds of ceremonial and elaboration of liturgical worship, testify, quite apart from the merits of any of them, to the increasing recognition of the diversity of the temperaments of men and of the duty of the Church to make them all feel at home in the family of God. We welcome the spirit of that expansion which has brought one part or another of our Communion nearer to those who are separated from us. We look forward hopefully to the far greater variety in the expression of the one faith and of devotion to the one Lord, which must necessarily ensue when the Churches of men who are strangers in blood, though brothers in Christ, come to fuller age and to more characteristic development. We call upon our fellow-churchmen in every branch of our Communion to accept ever more fully the standard of the universal Church and its necessary inclusiveness, so that they will not feel strange when they are called upon to live in the fellowship of the re-united universal Church.

Meanwhile, the needs of the whole world lay upon Christian men and women everywhere the obligation to manifest the fellowship which they already possess as believers in the one Lord, and as the soldiers and servants of His Kingdom, by praying and working together for the vindication of the Christian Faith and the extension of the rule of Christ among all nations and over every region of human life. We therefore recommend that,

where it has not already been done, Councils representing all Christian Communion should be formed within such areas as may be deemed most convenient, as centres of united effort to promote the physical, moral and social welfare of the people and the spread of the Kingdom of God and of His righteousness among men. Such co-operation will, we are confident, both strengthen the desire and prepare the way for a fuller spiritual union of life and worship.

## PART II.

## REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE (b) ON RELATION TO AND REUNION WITH NON-EPISCOPAL CHURCHES.

[NOTE.—*In view of the fact that the report of Sub-Committee (b) on Non-Episcopal Churches is specially based upon the Appeal to all Christian People, and repeatedly refers to it, it is here placed before the report of Sub-Committee (a) on Episcopal Churches.*]

We first pass in review the movements towards reunion in which the Anglican Churches have recently been involved.

The character of the movement towards reunion with non-episcopal Churches since the last Lambeth Conference has been dramatic and impressive. This is notably true of the movement in the American Church in 1910, resulting in the proposals for a World Conference on Questions of Faith and Order, which shall represent all Christians and which has already secured the interest and co-operation of many Christian bodies throughout the world. Further, in almost every section of the Anglican Communion conferences with other Churches have been held, in not a few cases definite proposals have been made, and in others actual schemes set forth. Of this we have received striking illustrations. They range from simple conferences where differences have been discussed and lines of agreement indicated, to definite proposals where substantial agreement has been obtained. In the first category are to be found the important first and second Interim Reports of the English Joint Sub-Committee appointed in connexion with the World Conference on Faith and Order, to which our Appeal, as set forth above, is greatly indebted. In addition to these, conferences between leading members of our Church and leaders of non-episcopal Churches have been held at Oxford and elsewhere; by chaplains and Y.M.C.A. workers in France; and by the Bishop of London with members of the Wesleyan Church; while the Convocations of both Canterbury and York have had under consideration certain proposals relating to united fellowship and worship.



All these witness to the deep and earnest longing in the hearts of all Christian men to draw nearer to each other, and, if possible, to find some solution of the difficulties which now stand in the way of visible union. Moreover, they all reveal a far greater measure of agreement, as to both faith and order, than is generally supposed to exist.

It is, however, in the more defined and official proposals for union that we perceive how great is the progress which has been attained.

Of these proposals the following have been specially brought before us for consideration.

In the United States of America a Concordat has been proposed by members of the Protestant Episcopal Church and Ministers of Congregational Churches. These proposals were presented to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church at Detroit in October, 1919. A series of resolutions was concurred in by both the House of Deputies and the House of Bishops, and a proposed canon has been drawn up. The whole matter is to be considered at the next General Convention which meets in 1922.

In South India a proposed union of the Anglican Church with the South India United Church (which includes five separate non-episcopal missions) has reached a stage at which the proposals may shortly be brought before the Episcopal Synod of the Province of India and Ceylon.

In East Africa a Constitution of an Alliance of Missionary Societies has been adopted, and the Members of the Alliance declare that they "pledge themselves not to rest until they can all share one Ministry."

In Australia proposals, having as their object a union with the Presbyterians, have been under consideration, and several conferences have been held with representatives of other non-Episcopal churches. Much will depend upon the decisions of this Conference as to the possibility of further progress in this region.

We have also received communications from Canada and China indicating the earnest desire of the Churches in both these parts of the world that definite steps in the cause of reunion may be taken.

The information which we have thus briefly summarized shews most impressively the strength of the tide which is everywhere setting towards a new Christian fellowship, but with equal impressiveness it shews the widely differing problems which the Churches of the Anglican Communion throughout the world are called to face. The conditions of national and religious life in regions so diverse as, for example, India, China, East Africa, Australia, the United States of America, Canada, Scotland and England, are obviously wholly different. There must be a corresponding variety in the ways along which union among

Christian people in these countries can be either approached or carried through. We therefore unanimously submit to the Conference the two following Resolutions:—

That this Conference desires to express its profound thankfulness for the important movements towards Unity which during the last twelve years have taken place in many parts of the world, and for the earnest desire for Reunion which has been manifested both in our own Communion and among the Churches now separated from us.

That this Conference confidently commits to the various authorities of the Churches within the Anglican Communion the task of effecting union with other Christian Communions on lines that are in general harmony with the principles underlying its proposals and resolutions.

We cannot insist too strongly that the resolutions which we now submit must be read and understood in the light of the ideal and principles of union which are set forth in the appeal which we have asked the Conference to issue. Taken by themselves they would inevitably misrepresent the warmth of desire and strength of hope by which we are animated. They must be regarded as counsels which the Conference may rightly be expected to give to the authorities of Churches in the Anglican Communion who desire to be guided aright in their efforts to set forward the cause of Christian Unity.

We consider that when men set their faces steadily towards the ideal of our appeal, and specially when negotiations for organic reunion are in progress or again when a scheme of union has in any place been adopted, situations will arise in which we should all agree that new lines of action may be followed. In regard to such situations, we submit to the Conference the following Resolutions:—

That a Bishop is justified in giving occasional authorization to ministers, not episcopally ordained, who in his judgement are working towards an ideal of union such as is described in our Appeal, to preach in churches within his Diocese, and to clergy of the Diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers.

That Bishops of the Anglican Communion will not question the action of any Bishop who, in the few years during which a definite scheme of union is maturing, shall countenance the irregularity of admitting to Communion the baptized but unconfirmed Communicants of the non-episcopal congregations concerned in the scheme.

Further, we deem it necessary in order that negotiations for union shall be steps towards and not away from our ideal, to express our dissent from certain proposals which have been, or might be, made, and which seem to us likely to obscure our ideal



or to hinder its fulfilment. Moreover, we deprecate such proposals as likely to prevent the members of our own Communion from forwarding the work of reunion with that enthusiastic unanimity with which it ought to be pursued. In these connexions we submit to the Conference the following Resolutions:—

That this Conference cannot approve of general schemes of intercommunion or exchange of pulpits.

That in accordance with the principle of Church order set forth in the Preface to the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer the Conference cannot approve the Celebration in Anglican churches of the Holy Communion for members of the Anglican Church by ministers who have not been episcopally ordained, and declares that the same principle requires that it should be regarded as the general rule of the Church that Anglican communicants should receive Holy Communion only at the hands of ministers of their own Church, or of Churches in communion therewith.

The general subject of the admission to Holy Communion of persons who do not belong to any Church in communion with us has been confused by certain doubts and varieties of practice on which we deem it desirable that this Conference should express its opinion. In this regard we submit to the Conference the following Resolutions which we believe to be applicable at all times, and not only in view of the approach of reunion:—

That no priest has canonical authority to refuse Communion to any baptized person kneeling before the Lord's Table, unless he be excommunicate by name, or, in the canonical sense of the term, a cause of scandal to the faithful.

Nothing in these Resolutions is intended to indicate that the rule of Confirmation as conditioning admission to the Holy Communion must necessarily apply to the case of baptized persons who seek Communion under conditions which in the Bishop's judgement justify their admission thereto.

It is plainly impossible to draft Resolutions which would meet every case that might arise anywhere in the course of negotiations for union or to suggest terms of union to meet every contingency. Great freedom must be left to the local negotiators, though in the exercise of it they must remember that similar negotiations in other places will be affected by what they do. Too great independence of action in one place may compromise action already taken elsewhere in stricter conformity with the words of the foregoing resolutions. No Communion, whether our own or another, conducting negotiations in several places, will consent to seriously divergent treatment of points which it counts fundamental.

With these considerations in mind we offer suggestions on

one case, at the request of some of our number. Some Provinces of our Communion, while agreeing to unite with a non-episcopal Communion on the basis of the acceptance of Episcopacy for the future, might be faced with the necessity of providing for the contingency that many ministers who at the time of the union were working in the non-episcopal Communion, would remain after the union without episcopal ordination. The following suggestions appear to us to satisfy the conditions of local freedom explained above:—

(a) Ministers of both the uniting Communions should be at once recognized as of equal status in all Synods and Councils of the United Church.

(b) The terms of union should not confer on non-episcopally ordained ministers the right to administer the Holy Communion to those congregations which already possess an episcopal ministry, but they should include the right to conduct other services and to preach in such churches, if licensed thereto by the Bishop.

(c) All other matters might well be left to the decision of the Provincial or General Synods of the United Church, in full confidence that these Synods will take care not to endanger that fellowship with the universal Church which is our common ultimate aim.

The Committee asks the Conference to pass a Resolution of general approval of these suggestions.

Our brethren who have the responsibility of carrying through any such negotiations may be assured of our confidence in their loyalty, and of the support of the continuing prayer and sympathy which will follow them in their venture.

In concluding our Report we think it only right to state at the request of some of our number that, with regard to the precise phrasing and practical effect of some of the Resolutions which we have submitted to the Conference, there was considerable difference of opinion. They were finally accepted as representing the measure of general agreement which in the present circumstances we judged to be attainable in our Communion as a whole and on which alone counsel could fitly be based for the guidance of Bishops in the exercise of their own responsibility. But this very pressure of inevitable differences and difficulties called out among men widely sundered in opinion a spirit of patience, consideration, and unity for which we desire reverently to offer our thanksgiving to Him from Whom cometh down every good and perfect gift.



## PART III.

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE (a) ON RELATION TO AND  
REUNION WITH EPISCOPAL CHURCHES.

## THE LATIN COMMUNION.

Your Committee feels that it is impossible to make any Report on Reunion with Episcopal Churches without some reference to the Church of Rome, even though it has no resolution to propose upon the subject. We cannot do better than make our own the words of the Report of 1908, which reminds us of "the fact that there can be no fulfilment of the Divine purpose in any scheme of reunion which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West, with which our history has been so closely associated in the past, and to which we are still bound by many ties of common faith and tradition." But we realize that—to continue the quotation—"any advance in this direction is at present barred by difficulties which we have not ourselves created, and which we cannot of ourselves remove." Should, however, the Church of Rome at any time desire to discuss conditions of reunion we shall be ready to welcome such discussions. We desire, moreover, very briefly to indicate that there are movements going on in the Church of Rome which may be fruitful in the future. There have been discussions in strict Roman Catholic circles in France as to the possibility of setting up an independent Gallican Church. The establishment of Houses of several of the Religious Orders at Oxford, and the part taken by their members in the discussions of theological societies there, together with their readiness to lecture at the "Summer School of Theology" which is entirely interdenominational, bear striking witness to the far greater freedom with which they enter into the intellectual life and interests of the Universities than formerly; while the appearance of a work entitled "The Problem of Reunion," by a former Professor of Stonyhurst, is not without significance. A few years ago there would have been no "Problem"; and though the writer maintains the traditional Roman position, he shews a marked difference, in tone and temperament, from what we have been accustomed to. They are also ready to join with us on a common platform in social and civic matters. Further, in spite of the official attitude taken by the Roman Church to our own with regard to religious ministrations during the war—an attitude which we greatly deplore—the personal relations, which obtained between their Chaplains and ours in France and else-

where, were often of the pleasantest character and led to a greatly increased knowledge and understanding of each other's position. It is obvious that no forward step can be taken yet; but the facts thus referred to may help to create in the future a very different position.

In what follows we desire to say how greatly we are indebted to the work of the last Lambeth Conference, and to the Reports of the several Committees appointed after its close. Lines of advance in various directions were then laid down, and along these lines the Committees made real progress. It would have been quite impossible for us in the time at our disposal to fulfil the task imposed upon us had it not been for this. We have for the most part taken up the work at the point at which they were compelled to leave it. We have not attempted to go behind their conclusions, or examine afresh the evidence upon which they based them; but, accepting them, we have worked upon them and have thus endeavoured to carry matters forward a stage nearer to the goal at which we are aiming.

## I

## THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH.

We will begin by speaking about the Church of Russia. During the earlier years after the last Lambeth Conference our relations with this Church were probably closer than with any other branch of the Eastern Church, nor were they interfered with in the first years of the War, and after the Revolution in 1917 it was hoped that the internal reforms which the Russian Church—set free from State dominance, and adapting itself to the new conditions of life—was endeavouring to introduce, might bring about still closer relations with us. This hope seemed to be confirmed by the fact that one of the last acts of the "Great Sobor" (Council) summoned by the Holy Synod was in September, 1918, to pass a resolution, welcoming "the sincere efforts of the Old Catholics and Anglicans towards union with the Orthodox Church," and calling on the sacred Synod "to organize a permanent commission with departments in Russia and abroad for the further study of Old Catholic and Anglican difficulties in the way of union, and for the furthering, as much as possible, of the speedy attainment of the final aim." Scarcely was this resolution passed before the Church in Russia was subjected to a renewed persecution, the horrors of which have hardly ever been exceeded. This is not the place to dwell on the martyrdoms of sixty bishops and hundreds of priests and other



persons. The memory of these things is in all our minds ; nor can we forget the way in which the Russian Church then turned to England, or the pathetic appeals addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury for help and protection. The Conference will, we believe, desire to pass a resolution expressing its intense sympathy with the Russian Church in the terrible trials to which it has been and apparently still is being subjected. We therefore append one to this Report. Even now the position in Russia is far from clear. Information filters through but slowly. But one thing seems to stand out as certain, *viz.*, that in the wreck and ruin of all other institutions, the Church, albeit stripped and despoiled, alone has survived, though sorely hampered and hindered in the performance of its work, and we believe that when the opportunity for reconstructing its proper organization is given to it, it will once again look to establish the friendliest relations with the Anglican Church, relations which we trust and pray may be more intimate than ever.

With the Church of Serbia we must also express our deep sympathy, in view of the calamities and special difficulties which the War brought upon it. In its hour of trial it turned to England for help which was readily extended, and it has been a particular privilege for Church people in England to assist in the reconstruction of the Serbian Church. The entire body of Serbian students for Holy Orders were at one time receiving their education under the auspices of the Church of England at Oxford, Cuddesdon, and elsewhere, while every care was taken to maintain full loyalty to the Serbian Church. Thus the closest relations were established between members of the two Churches, largely through the instrumentality of Father Nicholai Velimirovic, now Bishop of Zicha. At the present moment a number of Serbian students for Holy Orders are receiving their training in America, and the same cordial relationships are in existence there. These things mark a stage in the direction of reunion, the full results of which will be increasingly manifest in years to come.

In Greece also, and indeed in all parts of the East, the War has profoundly affected our relations with the Orthodox Church. It has brought the Anglican and Eastern Churches much nearer to each other. We hear from many different places of remarkable instances of what we may call informal acts of intercommunion in emergencies which would have been quite impossible a few years ago, and which shew the close sympathy there is between the two Churches. The War has changed the attitude of the East to Western Christendom. We are told that there is a great turning to England and America, and a desire to know more about us and our Communion, about which there is still too little known in the East generally. But partly because of the position of England in the War, and because of belief in its power, there has been a real stretching out of hands and a desire

shewn in more than one quarter to learn and make advances towards us. It is well understood by this time in the East that we have no ulterior aims in seeking closer relations with them, and we are free from the suspicion of any attempt to proselytize, an attempt which naturally they would bitterly resent. During these last few years we have had several visits to our shores from distinguished Eastern prelates, and important Conferences have been held both in this country and in America for the discussion of doctrinal questions. We note also the cordial reception accorded to the Bishop of London and others in their visits to the East, and in particular the position assigned at the Liturgy to the Bishop of Gibraltar and the Bishop of Harrisburg, which seems to have gone beyond the extension of ordinary courtesies. These things will bear fruit in years to come. Another welcome sign of East and West drawing closer together is found in the letter from the *Locum tenens* of the Œcumenical Patriarchate at Constantinople "unto all the Churches of Christ wheresoever they be," which was sent from the Phanar to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Chief in importance, however, has been the visit of a special delegation from the Œcumenical Patriarchate to London, for purposes of consultation with Bishops attending the Lambeth Conference on relations between the Orthodox and Anglican Communion. This visit was the result of a formal invitation from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the *Locum tenens* of the Œcumenical Patriarchate at Constantinople. To this visit we have reason to attach the greatest importance. The delegation, consisting of Philaretos the Metropolitan of Demotica, Professor Komninos of Halki, the Archimandrite Pagonis of London, and the Archpriest Callinicos of Manchester, was welcomed by the President in full session of the Conference, and your Committee has had the advantage of more than one conference with it, at which important questions, doctrinal and practical, were discussed and full consideration given to the matters specified in the letter from the Phanar referred to above, in which letter we would call special attention to the desire expressed for immediate co-operation in matters of social reform.

Along the lines here briefly indicated we believe that we are steadily moving towards the goal of ultimate reunion. But there is much still to be done before this is reached, and our progress will be not less sure because it is slow. We still require to gain greater knowledge and understanding of each other's position. Explanations are needed on both sides, and it is clear that when the day comes for definite proposals of formal intercommunion to be made, they will have to be based on a large-hearted tolerance on both sides, and a readiness on the part of each Church to be content with holding its own uses and practices without attempting to ask for conformity to them on the part of the other.



Meanwhile, we look for much from the Eastern Churches Committee recently appointed on a permanent basis by the Archbishop of Canterbury in pursuance of Resolution 61 of the last Lambeth Conference. We are glad to learn that this action has been met by the appointment of somewhat similar Committees both at Constantinople and at Athens. The American Church has also appointed a permanent Commission to confer with the Eastern Churches. We believe that through the action of these Committees further important steps towards reunion may be taken, partly by the free discussion of doctrinal matters, e.g., the meaning of the Filioque clause, as not involving any belief on our part in more than one *altria* in the Godhead, our doctrine of holy orders, the position of the XXXIX Articles, on all of which matters the Easterns are asking for information, and partly also by conference on practical matters of moment, such as the better regulation of mixed marriages, the reciprocal administration of the Sacraments in cases of emergency, a uniform Kalendar, possibly involving the appointment of a fixed Easter, and other questions raised in the letter from the Phanar.

We need at the present time not only or chiefly to afford to the Easterns historical evidence of the handing down of our ministry, but also to explain the doctrinal position held by our Communion. It is in particular of the first importance, in order to remove Oriental misconceptions, to make it clear from our formularies that we regard Ordination as conferring grace, and not only as a mere setting apart to an ecclesiastical office. It would also (though in a lesser degree) be a help, as well as a good thing in itself, to restore the true text of the "Nicene" Creed, as it is used in all parts of the East and West, except in our Communion, by replacing the word "Holy" before "Catholic and Apostolic Church."

If some members of the Eastern Churches' Committee could visit Athens or Constantinople for conferences to be held there, such as those already held in this country and in America, we believe that they would not only meet with a cordial welcome, but also be able to do much to remove misconceptions, and to prepare the way for the ultimate reunion which both Churches alike so earnestly desire, and for which they make their constant prayer.

## II.

### THE SEPARATED CHURCHES OF THE EAST.

Since the last Lambeth Conference further steps have been taken towards a better understanding of, and in some cases a nearer relation to, those Ancient Churches of the East which by

reason mainly of the Christological dissensions of the Fifth century have been separated from the rest of Christianity. But the persecutions which many of them, notably the Armenians, Nestorians, and Syrian Jacobites, have been called upon to suffer, both before and during the Great War, and the terrible massacres that have taken place among them, have prevented as great progress being made as might have been hoped. That they have so greatly suffered for the Christian faith and have refused to apostatize from it under persecution is a fact which must call for our deepest sympathy and respect.

These Churches have all at some period of their history been accused of theological error with regard to the Incarnation, and it is, therefore, necessary that we should examine with some care their doctrinal position at the present time. The Lambeth Conference of 1908 desired the formation of Commissions to do this, and "to prepare some carefully framed statement of the faith as to our Lord's Person, in the simplest possible terms, which should be submitted to each of such Churches where feasible, in order to ascertain whether it represents their belief with substantial accuracy." Further, the Conference suggested that if such a statement were found to be acceptable to any such Church occasional intercommunion might be advantageously provided for. A Commission was formed, and proceeded to take action with reference to the *East Syrian, Assyrian, or Nestorian Church*; and it resolved that the statement of Catholic doctrine to be submitted to this Church, or to any other that lay under analogous suspicion of error as to the Incarnation, should be the Christological versicles of the Quicumque Vult. The Commission also resolved to ask the East Syrian Church to explain in what sense it used the term "Mother of Christ" as its technical description of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The Archbishop of Canterbury wrote to this effect to the now deceased Patriarch Benjamin Mar Shimun, Catholicos of the East, who, after consultation with his bishops, and with their assent, returned answer under date June 13th, 1911, entirely accepting the statement of faith propounded to him, as expressing the belief of that Church, and giving an explanation of the use of the term "Mother of Christ" which was considered entirely satisfactory by the Commission. With this judgement your present Committee agree.

It was, however, more important still that a careful examination of the East Syrian voluminous liturgical books should be made. This has been done, with the result that it is seen that they contain much that is incompatible with real Nestorianism, together with some things that might be interpreted either in an orthodox or in a Nestorian sense; it is suggested that the latter must be judged by the former. The watchword Theotokos is absent from their service books, and in one place is repudiated;



on the other hand, its equivalent in other words is several times found, and strong instances of the language known as *communicatio idiomatum* occur. One phrase, which has caused some perplexity, is that which asserts that there are in Christ one *paršōpā* (πρόσωπον), two *Qnōmé*, and two natures. The word *Qnōmā* is equivalent to "hypostasis," and if used in the later sense of that word, *i.e.* as meaning "person," it would imply real Nestorianism; but research has made it plain that it is used in the earlier sense of "hypostasis," namely, "substance," and this makes the phrase, if redundant, at least perfectly orthodox. It should be added that the East Syrians accept the decrees of Chalcedon, while rejecting those of Ephesus.

Your Committee agree with the Commission in thinking that we need not insist on the East Syrian Church ceasing to mention in their services the names of those whom it has hitherto revered.

They suggest that if the Archbishop of Canterbury finds that the present East Syrian authorities adhere to the answer given in 1911, there is no reason why occasional intercommunion should not be established. They also think that opportunity should be taken to inform the authorities of the Eastern Orthodox Churches about these proposals.

*The Jacobites or West Syrians.*—Since the last Lambeth Conference the Jacobite Patriarch, Mar Ignatius Abdullah II, has visited this country. His interview with the late Bishop of Salisbury (Dr. J. Wordsworth) at the end of 1908 gives us much information as to the doctrinal position of his Church; in particular he called attention to the *Statement of Faith*, or Creed, of which an English translation was published by the Syrian Patriarchate Education Committee in 1908, and by Dr. Wordsworth in 1909, as being a very ancient and authoritative document by which his Church was solemnly bound. This *Statement of Faith* denies that the divine nature of our Lord was commingled with the human nature, or that the two natures became commixed and changed so as to give rise to a third nature, and asserts that the two natures became united in indissoluble union without confusion, mixture, or transmutation, and that they remained two natures in an unalterable unity (§ 12). The *Statement of Faith* is quite free from Monophysitism, and contains the emphatic assertion that the Trisagion as recited by the Jacobites, with the addition of "who wast crucified for us"—an addition long looked on as a strong mark of error—is addressed, not to the Holy Trinity, but solely "to the only-begotten Son, the Word, who was pleased to be born of the Holy Virgin Mary and became flesh" (§ 22).

Your Committee regretfully recognize that the present moment, when under the draft Turkish Treaty the West Syrians remain under Turkish rule, is not specially suitable for endeavouring to establish closer relations with them; but suggest that the

recently appointed Eastern Churches Committee should watch for any suitable opportunity for doing so, and that when such opportunity arises, the above considerations will greatly diminish any doctrinal difficulties. In the meantime a great desideratum is a better knowledge of the Jacobite liturgical books, which are mostly in manuscript.

*Copts and Abyssinians.*—The above-mentioned Patriarch, Mar Ignatius Abdullah, stated that there is free intercourse between West Syrians, Armenians, Copts, and Abyssinians. In view of this fact any problems as to nearer relations between them and ourselves would be greatly simplified. At any moment opportunities of closer official relations with the Copts may arise, and in view of them your Committee suggest the desirability of a more thorough examination of their service books than has yet been made.

*The Armenians.*—This great and much-suffering Church has always repudiated charges of Eutychianism or of Monophysitism, and it is probable that their refusal to accept the decrees of Chalcedon is due to their having been prevented by political causes from being present at that Council, and to its decisions having reached them in a faulty version. Your Committee would express the hope that by the speedy development of mutual intercourse and investigation, closer relations may be established between them and ourselves, and that the Eastern Churches Committee should be asked to take notice of any suitable opportunity in this direction.

*The Christians of St. Thomas in Malabar.*—In so far as these Christians give allegiance to the West or East Syrians, the remarks made about those Churches apply here. In another part of this report reference is made to a large scheme of reunion which is being discussed in Southern India, and is intended to include some at least of these Christians.

Your Committee would suggest that it is not necessary, even if it were possible, to determine how far the Separated Churches of the East have been in the past really implicated in the errors which have been attributed to them; but they think that the investigations of the last twelve years have gone a great way to shew that they have at any rate grown out of any errors they may have held on the Person and Natures of our Lord. The more this is made clear, the more it will appear to be possible to arrive at occasional intercommunion, at the least. But it is desirable that an endeavour should be made, as we move forward step by step in this direction, to explain our attitude carefully to the authorities of the Orthodox Eastern Church, that all misconceptions with regard to the subject on the part of that great Communion may be removed. Indeed, we have good reason to believe that such action as is here indicated would in no ways prejudice our relations with the Orthodox,



## III.

## THE CHURCH OF SWEDEN.

In consequence of Resolution 74 of the last Lambeth Conference a Commission was appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1909 under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Ryle) to correspond with the Swedish Church on the possibility suggested by the Archbishop of Upsala (Dr. Ekman) of an "alliance of some sort" between the Swedish and Anglican Churches. In the autumn of the same year the Commission visited Sweden and held an important Conference with distinguished representatives of the Swedish Church. At this Conference explanations were given with regard to the Episcopal succession in both countries and with regard to other matters which required elucidation, and a Committee was appointed by the Archbishop of Upsala to act with him for the purpose of continuing if necessary the discussions initiated in the Conference. In the following year Bishop John Wordsworth delivered his memorable "Hale Lectures" (published in 1911) on "The National Church of Sweden." In the same year was also published a learned work by another member of the Anglican Commission, *viz.*, Bishop Mott Williams (then Bishop of Marquette), on "The Church of Sweden and the Anglican Communion." These two volumes dealt fully with the question of the succession of Swedish orders, and did much to remove the doubts previously felt on this subject in some quarters. In the course of the next year (1911) the Archbishop's Commission made its formal report, in which it stated the following conclusions, arrived at after full consideration of the evidence laid before it:—

"(1) That the succession of bishops has been maintained unbroken by the Church of Sweden, and that it has a true conception of the episcopal office . . . and (2) that the office of priest is also rightly conceived as a divinely instituted instrument for the ministry of Word and Sacraments, and that it has been in intention handed on throughout the whole history of the Church of Sweden."

Accepting these conclusions, they based on them a recommendation that a resolution should be proposed, similar to that which was adopted by the Lambeth Conference of 1888 in reference to the Old Catholics of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, under which members of the National Church of Sweden, otherwise qualified to receive the Sacrament in their own Church, might be admitted to Communion in ours. They also suggested that "permission might with advantage occasionally be given to Swedish ecclesiastics to give addresses in our churches," and that "notice should be sent to the Archbishop of Upsala of important events or appointments within the Church of England,

and that we should welcome similar information on his part"—a suggestion which, we understand, has been already to some extent acted upon. Further, they said that "as regards facilities for the use of churches for marriages, burials, and the like where Swedish churches are not available, we believe that concession on this head is within the competence of any diocesan bishop, and we trust that such facilities may be generally granted."

We accept the conclusions arrived at by the learned men who formed this Commission, on the unbroken succession of the Episcopate in Sweden, and on the conception of the office of priest held by that Church; and we recommend to the Conference the adoption of the definite recommendations cited above. We also hold that the time has come when, in the event of an invitation to an Anglican bishop or bishops to take part in the consecration of a Swedish bishop, it might properly be accepted. Such an invitation was, we understand, actually made in the year 1914, but it was then thought that the time had not come for such action, as the Report of the Commission had not been then before the Lambeth Conference. This reason no longer exists, and in the event of our resolutions based on this Report being approved, we believe that there need be hesitation no longer. Only we would add the recommendation that the acceptance of any such invitation should be subject to the approval of the Metropolitan of the Province, so that the invitation might be considered as one made from Church to Church, and not simply as a personal matter. We think also that in the first instance, as an evident token of the restoration of close relations between the two Churches, it is desirable that more than one of our bishops should take part in the action.

We ought not to conclude this section of our Report without stating that we are fully aware that in regard to the Diaconate and the administration of Confirmation the Swedish Church does not conform to the practice required within the Anglican Communion. But we have come to the conclusion that this fact ought not to be allowed to be a bar to such more intimate relations as we recommend. We express a hope, however, that as a result of the closer intimacy which we desire to be established, an intimacy which is happily encouraged and fostered by the presence of many Swedish students in this country, the Swedish Church may be led to consider the restoration of the Diaconate, and also of the laying-on of hands as an outward sign of grace given in Confirmation.\*

\* The subjects of the diaconate and Confirmation were considered at the Conference at Upsala in 1909. See the *Report of the Commission*, pp. 10, 11. Reference may also be made to Bishop Wordsworth's *Hale Lectures*, pp. 354-55, and 417-18, and Bishop Mott Williams' *The Church of Sweden and the Anglican Communion*, pp. 66-81.



We have said nothing in this Report of the other Scandinavian Churches, *viz.* those of Denmark, Norway, and Finland; not from any lack of sympathy or of desire for closer relations with them, but because the problem in their case is different from that in the case of the Church of Sweden, and because we believe that the time has not yet come for such negotiations to be entered into with them as are now proceeding with the Swedish Church. We hold, therefore, that at present it is wise to be content with aiming at closer alliance with the last-named Church alone.

## IV.

## THE OLD CATHOLICS.

The "friendly relations" with the Old Catholics referred to in Resolution 68 of the last Lambeth Conference were steadily carried on, until the outbreak of the War in 1914 rendered communications and intercourse with them very difficult, and in some places quite impossible. Even now, although hostilities have ceased for more than a year and a half, the disturbed and unsettled condition of a large part of Europe remains a great hindrance to intercourse. We look forward, however, hopefully to a resumption in the near future of such happy relations as existed before the war, and it is a hopeful sign that the Old Catholic Bishops have quite recently been able for the first time for several years to meet together in Conference. Mention should also be made here of the remarkable rise of the Mariaviten Church in Poland, which has naturally suffered greatly during the War, and of the recent movement for reforms of various kinds within the Roman Catholic Church in Czecho-Slovakia, a movement the course of which we shall watch with interest.

In Resolution 69 of 1908 the Conference deprecated "the setting up of a new organised body in regions where a Church with apostolic ministry and Catholic doctrine offers religious privileges without the imposition of uncatholic terms of communion." The occasion which called forth this resolution was the consecration, at Utrecht on April 28th, 1908, of the Rev. A. H. Mathew by the Old Catholic Bishops for work in this country; and the resolution was at the request of the Conference communicated to the Archbishop of Utrecht by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Your Committee note with thankfulness that, in reply to this, explanations were offered by the Archbishop of Utrecht, and a promise made that in future they "would take care not to make trouble by encroaching on the order of a friendly Church." This statement has quite recently been followed up by a formal pronouncement by the Old Catholic

Bishops assembled at Utrecht on April 28th and 29th, 1920, in which they state categorically that the episcopal consecration of the Rev. A. H. Mathew "was surreptitiously secured by the production of false testimony, and would never have taken place had the consecrators known that the conditions stated in the questionable documents and required by our Episcopate were non-existent." They also state that on the discovery of the facts they "broke off intercourse with him," and "without entering on the question whether an ordination obtained by sacrilegious fraud can be valid" declare that they "have no ecclesiastical relations" with those persons who claim to have received ordination or consecration from the aforesaid person. In these circumstances your Committee have had to consider most carefully what should be the attitude of the Anglican Communion to those persons who claim to exercise priestly or episcopal functions with a succession derived from Bishop Mathew personally, or from those who claim to be his successors in the Episcopate; and on a review of all the facts they are driven to the conclusion that it is not possible to regard the so-called "Old Catholic Church in Great Britain," disclaimed as it is by the Old Catholics on the Continent, as a properly constituted branch of the Church, or to recognize the orders of its ministers. The circumstances of Bishop Mathew's consecration are so uncertain, and his subsequent isolation is so complete, that, without casting any sort of reflection on the validity of Old Catholic orders, or discussing the theological question of abstract "validity," we feel that as a matter of practice, in the event of any persons ordained by him or by his successors desiring to come over to the Anglican Church, and exercise their ministry in communion with it, the only proper course would be for them (if in all respects suitable) to be ordained *sub conditione*.\* We recommend therefore that this course should be followed, and that, in order to make the position perfectly clear, the condition should be definitely stated in a document subscribed both by the Bishop ordaining and by the person to be ordained, and further that it should be expressed in the Letters of Orders, somewhat after the precedent set by Archbishop Bramhall in the case of some Presbyterians ordained by him in the Seventeenth century.†

\* A Memorandum on "Conditional Ordination" was prepared by the Bishop of Gloucester for the use of the Conference, and will shortly be published.

† The following is the form used by Bramhall:—"Non annihilantes priores ordines (si quos habuit) nec invaliditatem eorum determinantes, multo minus omnes ordines sacros ecclesiarum forinsecarum condemnantes, quos proprio Judici relinquimus, sed solummodo suppletentes quicquid prius defuit per canones ecclesie Anglicanae requisitum, et providentes paci ecclesie, ut schismatis tollatur occasio, et conscientis fidelium satisfiat nec ulli dubitent de ejus ordinatione, aut actus suos presbyteriales tanquam invalidos aversentur."—Bramhall's *Works*, vol. i., p. 37.



A similar course we recommend to be followed in the case of persons ordained by Bishop Vernon Herford, "Bishop of Mercia" (who claims to have received consecration from "Mar Basilius, Metropolitan of India, &c."), or by other "episcopi vagantes," whose consecration and status we are unable to recognize. But before action is taken in this way by any individual Bishop we recommend that, after he has satisfied himself that the case is one in which it is desirable to proceed (a most necessary precaution), he should consult the Metropolitan of the Province, and place the case fully before him.

## V.

THE *UNITAS FRATRUM* OR MORAVIANS.

The question of the position of the Moravians was first referred to in the Lambeth Conference so far back as 1878; but nothing of importance was done until in 1897 the Conference passed the two following resolutions:—"37. That this Conference, not possessing sufficient information to warrant the expression of a decided opinion upon the question of the orders of the *Unitas Fratrum* or Moravians, must content itself with expressing a hearty desire for such relations with them as will aid the cause of Christian Unity, and with recommending that there should be on the part of the Anglican Communion further consideration of the whole subject, in the hope of establishing closer relations between the *Unitas Fratrum* and the Churches represented in this Conference." "38. That the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to appoint a Committee to conduct the further investigation of the subject, and for such purpose to confer with the authorities or representatives of the *Unitas Fratrum*." In accordance with this resolution a Committee was appointed in 1906 by the Archbishop of Canterbury which entered on a thorough investigation of the question of the succession of Moravian Bishops, the result of which was that in their opinion, though "a succession of regularly constituted ministers has beyond question been maintained in that community from the year 1467 to the present time," it is "a matter of grave doubt whether the ministry so maintained is in the strict sense an episcopal ministry." The Committee, which issued its Report in 1907, most regretfully arrived at this conclusion, *viz.* that "the way to immediate intercommunion with the Unity as a Sister Church seems to be at present barred by the great uncertainty of its possessing the historic Episcopate." This conclusion was received with great disappointment by the authorities of the Moravians, who, as was perhaps natural, could not agree with the verdict on the historical question, but frankly

recognized that any further negotiations on the part of the Anglican Church could only be carried on on the basis of that Report. They were, however, desirous that the next Lambeth Conference might take the matter up again, and asked that we should consider the possibility of such participation on our side in Moravian consecrations as would put Moravian orders for the future into a position satisfactory to Anglicans. Accordingly the matter came up again at the Conference of 1908; and the following resolutions were adopted:—

"70. For the sake of unity, and as a particular expression of brotherly affection, we recommend that any official request of the *Unitas Fratrum* for the participation of Anglican Bishops in the consecration of Bishops of the *Unitas* should be accepted, provided that

"(i) Such Anglican Bishops should be not less than three in number, and should participate both in the saying of the Prayers of Consecration and in the laying on of hands, and that the rite itself is judged to be sufficient by the Bishops of the Church of our Communion to which the invited Bishops belong;

"(ii) The Synods of the *Unitas* (a) are able to give sufficient assurance of doctrinal agreement with ourselves in all essentials (as we believe that they will be willing and able to do); and (b) are willing to explain its position as that of a religious community or missionary body in close alliance with the Anglican Communion; and (c) are willing to accord a due recognition to the position of our Bishops within Anglican Dioceses and jurisdictions; and (d) are willing to adopt a rule as to the administration of Confirmation more akin to our own.

"71. After the conditions prescribed in the preceding Resolution have been complied with, and a Bishop has been consecrated in accordance with them, corresponding invitations from any Bishop of the *Unitas Fratrum* to an Anglican Bishop and his Presbyters to participate in the Ordination of a Moravian Presbyter should be accepted, provided that the Anglican Bishop should participate both in the saying of the Prayers of Ordination and in the laying-on of hands, and that the rite itself is judged to be sufficient by the Bishops of the Church of our Communion to which the invited Bishop belongs.

"72. Any Bishop or Presbyter so consecrated or ordained should be free to minister in the Anglican Communion with due episcopal licence; and, in the event of the above proposals, *i.e.* Resolutions 1 and 2, being accepted and acted upon by the Synods of the *Unitas*, during the period of transition some permission to preach in our churches might on special occasions be extended to Moravian Ministers by Bishops of our Communion.

"73. We recommend that the Archbishop of Canterbury be respectfully requested to name a Committee to communicate,



as need arises, with representatives of the *Unitas*, and also to direct that the decisions of the present Conference be communicated to the *Secretarius Unitatis*."

This last resolution was promptly carried out. A Committee was appointed under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Durham (Dr. Moule) and negotiations were entered upon with the *Unitas*. The course of these negotiations and the explanations offered by the Moravians are fully described in the Report of the Committee which was prepared in 1913, and in which they state that the "conditions contained in Resolution 70 (i) and (ii) have now been satisfied." Since then, however, questions have arisen as to the completeness of the fulfilment of the conditions on the part of the *Unitas*, especially in regard to provisions (b) and (c), and even more in regard to (d), as it now appears that the *Unitas* permits deacons to celebrate Holy Communion, and also to administer Confirmation. This fact was unknown to the Committee when it made its report early in 1913. Since then the subject has been on two occasions brought before the Central Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conference (in July, 1913, and again in 1914), and that body came to the conclusion that it "did not feel itself justified in saying that in its judgement the conditions laid down in 70 (ii) of the Lambeth Conference have been so completely and satisfactorily met as to enable the participating action to be carried out," and it "recommended that the full Lambeth Conference at its next meeting should have an opportunity of expressing its opinion." From this time till now negotiations have been practically in abeyance, though quite recently informal communications have taken place between one or more members of the Committee and the Moravians. In these circumstances your Committee has had to consider the matter most carefully, and we have been greatly helped by a conference with Bishop Mumford, the President of the Provincial Board of the Moravian Church in Great Britain and Ireland. The time at our disposal has been too short for us to go into the questions at issue as fully as we would wish to have done. We are agreed, however, that condition (a) in 70 (ii) is satisfied; but there is still some uncertainty as to (b) and (c); and it is in our opinion impossible for any such action to take place as is contemplated in the resolution so long as the present practice of the Moravians in regard to the celebration of the Holy Communion and the administration of Confirmation by deacons remains unchanged. It might be possible, we think, for the fact of Confirmation by a Presbyter to be regarded as no bar to the measure of intercommunion proposed, provided that it were distinctly laid down that authority for such action on the part of Presbyters was directly delegated to them by the Bishop, there being precedents or this both in East and West. And if the *Unitas Fratrum*

can see its way to meet our requirements in these matters we think that negotiations with them might well be resumed, and we hope that the result would be that any remaining uncertainty as to 70 (ii) (b) and (c) would be removed. Should this happy consummation be arrived at we believe that they might then, through the Archbishop of Canterbury, invite Anglican Bishops to participate in a consecration without fear of refusal. The existing difficulties have already been brought before the authorities of the *Unitas*, and we are encouraged by statements made to us to hope that such a change of rule on its part is not out of the question. We therefore suggest that the Committee appointed after the last Lambeth Conference should be continued in existence, and strengthened by the addition of two members to supply the place of the late Bishop of Durham and Bishop Mitchinson; and that this Committee should be ready, whenever the proper time comes, to re-enter upon negotiations with the *Unitas*; and we further recommend that if the difficulties described above can be removed to the satisfaction of the Archbishop of Canterbury with the concurrence of the Consultative Body, there would then be no need to wait for another Lambeth Conference before action was taken. It should be added that in making these recommendations we have directly in view only the branch of the *Unitas Fratrum* in the British Isles. We are given to understand that as "a full Province" it has complete liberty to act by itself in this matter. But if the negotiations with the *Unitas* in the British Province can be carried to a successful issue, a valuable precedent will have been set, which may well be followed in other Provinces, and thus lead ultimately to complete intercommunion between the Anglican Communion and the *Unitas* in all parts of the world.

## VI.

### "THE REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH."

This body has now about twenty-five congregations or churches in England served by thirty or forty ministers. It was introduced into this country from America, where it originated in 1866, and where there are still a certain number of its congregations. We are called on to consider it here because its "Southern Synod" has passed "by a large majority," and forwarded to the authorities of the English Church, the following resolution:—

"This Synod, being desirous, so far as in it lies, of maintaining unity among all Christian people, would be prepared to consider the question of the Union of the Reformed Episcopal Church with



the Established Church of England, provided that the ministers of the Reformed Episcopal Church are received as clergy duly ordained in accordance with the Articles of that Church, and that it is allowed to retain its Declaration of Principles unaltered with its Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship, as set forth in its Constitution, Canons, and Prayer Book."

Less formal proposals of a somewhat different character have also been received, suggesting that "the clergy should be re-ordained by the Anglican Bishops (or by one Bishop acting for the rest) and be permitted to minister to the congregations that they are at present serving, and that the congregations should be admitted to union with the Church of England under the provisions of an approved trust deed, which would secure the maintenance of the Evangelical character of their work."

Your Committee has had before it full particulars not only of the organization, worship, and principles of this body, but also of the origin of its ministry, and its claim to an Episcopal succession.\* The members of the Committee find themselves quite unable to recommend the Conference to accept that claim. On this ground, therefore, they are compelled to recommend the Conference to decline to enter into negotiations with the Synod on the basis of the proposals made by it. With regard to the less formal proposal, they feel it necessary to point out that evidence has been before them that the standard of qualifications for the ministry in the Reformed Episcopal Church is such that it would not be easy for us to take any action with regard to the body corporately. Difficulties would arise in individual cases which in so small a body might assume serious proportions. There are also matters such as the nature of their trust deeds and the character of their Prayer Book, which might easily lead to complications. We think therefore that it is not desirable to enter into negotiations with the body as a whole. But, as the experience of the last few years has shewn that a tendency exists in both ministers and congregations of the Reformed Episcopal Church to apply for reunion with the Church of England, we recommend that such applications should be, wherever possible, sympathetically treated, and that if the minister satisfies our standards intellectually as well as in other ways, he should be ordained *sub conditione*; and that if the practical difficulties in the way of

\* The origin of the Reformed Episcopal Church is explained in "A Statement in regard to Ordinations or Consecrations performed by Dr. Cummins, or others claiming Ordination or Consecration from him, prepared by the Presiding Bishop of the American Church, the Right Rev. John Williams, D.D., LL.D.," which was submitted to the Lambeth Conference of 1888. The chief facts stated in this document are apparently not denied, though the conclusions drawn from them are traversed in *The Origin, Orders, Organisation, and Worship of the Reformed Episcopal Church in the United Kingdom*, by Philip X. Eldridge, D.D., Presiding Bishop (1910).

congregations joining us can be overcome they should be received on the condition that as loyal English Church people they accept the Book of Common Prayer in place of the book now in use in the Reformed Episcopal Church.

#### PART IV.

#### CONCLUSION.

It is impossible for those who have worked point by point over the difficult ground covered by this Report to judge what impression it will make upon those who come to it freshly and as a whole. Some will probably find in it at some points laxity in the enforcement of principle: others may charge it with rigidity.

To some it will seem to move too rashly: others will complain that it moves so little. Yet most earnestly do we hope that there may be real value found in what has been arrived at with so large a measure of unity, and with a sense of constraint towards agreement which surprised ourselves, and seemed, as we reverently believe, to be of the Spirit's guidance.

The wounds of the Church of Christ are very deep and very stiff with time and controversy.

They cannot be quickly healed. Rather will they have to be first more deeply probed, and the measure of the contrast between men's doings and God's purpose more fully understood. Certainly the sense of being drawn together and drawn upward was never so strong or so uplifting as when we were moved to look beyond smaller ideals and limited agreements to the vision of the One Holy Catholic Church of the Divine Redeemer, into which all the divided groups of His faithful people must bring what they have of glory and honour, and which cannot be made perfect till all its parts are drawn together in Him. If there is any value in this Report it comes from the inspiration of that only true and divine ideal.

(Signed) COSMO EBOR:

*Chairman.*