

280 B43d

56-08801

Bell

Documents on Christian unity

280 B43d

56-08801

Bell \$2.26

Documents on Christian unity

kansas city



public library

kansas city, missouri

Books will be issued only
on presentation of library card.

Please report lost cards and
change of residence promptly.

Card holders are responsible for
all books, records, films, pictures
or other library materials
checked out on their cards.

DOCUMENTS ON
CHRISTIAN UNITY

1920-30

DOCUMENTS ON CHRISTIAN UNITY

*A SELECTION FROM THE
FIRST AND SECOND SERIES*

1920-30

Edited by

G. K. A. BELL
BISHOP OF CHICHESTER

GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

London New York Toronto

1955

Oxford University Press, Amen House, London E.C. 4

GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE WELLINGTON

BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS KARACHI CAPE TOWN IBADAN

Geoffrey Cumberlege, Publisher to the University

First published in

Documents on Christian Unity, 1920-24 (1924) and

Documents on Christian Unity, Second Series (1930)

Combined edition issued 1930 as

Documents on Christian Unity, 1920-30

This selection first published 1955

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

PREFACE

THE volume *Documents on Christian Unity 1920-4*, published in 1924, was the first of a sequence of three: *Documents on Christian Unity, Second Series*, appeared in 1930 and was followed, after the War, by *Documents on Christian Unity, Third Series, 1930-48*. This last remains available but the two former volumes are out of print, and in response to requests from various quarters at home and abroad the present volume has been produced to make available to all interested in Christian unity, and particularly to the increasing number of Christians concerned in the Ecumenical Movement, those documents from the period 1920-30 which seem most likely to be required for reference and study at the present time. Together with the *Third Series* of Documents there is thus available a continuous sequence of source material for the period from the Lambeth Appeal of 1920 down to the eve of the inauguration of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam in 1948—Document 318 in the *Third Series* being the Constitution which was presented to the Council at Amsterdam for approval.

The numbering of Documents in this volume is the same as in the former two separate volumes, so that references to any document by its number (but not by page) will be unambiguous. The Documents have been left in numerical order, under the original section headings, and this means that some headings appear twice: once for the period 1920-4 and the second time for 1924-30.

In one case only has material not in the original publication been added: in Document 58, Canon 36 of the American Episcopal Church, the present section 6, which was added to the Canon at a subsequent General Convention, is included so that the Canon appears in its now current form.

Full Acknowledgements to the individuals and corporate bodies that placed documents at the Editor's disposal will be found in the Prefaces to the original volumes ; and though these are not repeated here, users of this volume who may wish to reproduce any Document, or any substantial extract, should consider whether the permission of the original authors or issuing body may be necessary. In case of doubt the publishers should be consulted regarding the original acknowledgements.

GEORGE CICESTR:

January 1955

CONTENTS

PREFACE	v
-------------------	---

From FIRST SERIES, 1920-4

I. THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE 1920	
1. An Appeal to All Christian People. August 1920	1
2. Resolutions (10-16) on the Reunion of Christendom. August 1920	5
3. Suggestions of the Sub-Committee on Reunion with non-Episcopal Churches. August 1920	9
II. THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER	
4. The Original Suggestion to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Cincinnati, Ohio, October 1910. December 1922	11
<i>See also Documents 91-101</i>	
III. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH	
10. Letter transmitting the Lambeth Appeal to His Holiness Pope Benedict XV together with Reply. May 1921	13
11. Extract from Encyclical Letter of His Holiness Pope Pius XI (<i>Ubi Arcano Dei</i>). December 1922	14
<i>See also Documents 112-13</i>	
IV. THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH	
13. Encyclical Letter from the Patriarchate of Constantinople. January 1920	17
17. Terms of Intercommunion suggested between the Church of England and the Churches in Communion with her and the Eastern Orthodox Church. Drawn up at the request of the Eastern Churches Committee. 1921	22
19. Constantinople and Anglican Ordinations. Letter of the Oecumenical Patriarch to the Archbishop of Canterbury. July 1922	35
20. Encyclical on Anglican Ordinations. From the Oecumenical Patriarch to the Presidents of the Particular Eastern Orthodox Churches. August 1922	36
[V. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND]	
VI. THE FREE CHURCHES IN ENGLAND AND THE LAMBETH APPEAL	
44. 'Church Unity'. The Report of a Joint Conference held at Lambeth Palace, together with a Preliminary	

Statement by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Moderator of the Federal Council. May 1922	39
45. The Federal Council. Resolutions adopted by the Annual Assembly. September 1922	47
46. Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry. Presented on behalf of the Church of England Representatives on the Joint Conference at Lambeth Palace. July 6, 1923	52
47. The Federal Council. Resolutions adopted by the Annual Assembly. September 18, 1923	60
<i>See also Documents 118-26</i>	
VII. THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND AND THE UNITED FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND	
48. The Church of Scotland Act. 1921	66
VIII. THE CHURCH OF SWEDEN	
53. The Reply of the Bishops of the Church of Sweden to the Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference 1920. April 1922	73
[IX. CHURCHES HOLDING THE PRESBYTERIAN SYSTEM]	
[X. EAST AFRICA]	
XI. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
58. The Protestant Episcopal Church. Canon 36. Of the Ordination of Deacons and Priests in Special Cases. (The Concordat Canon.) September 1922, revised 1934	84
60. The Protestant Episcopal Church and the Czecho-Slovak Orthodox Church in America. Resolution of the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church. December 13, 1922	88
[XII. AUSTRALIA]	
XIII. CANADA	
65. The United Church of Canada. The Basis of Union as agreed upon by the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches in Canada. January 1924	91
[XIV. CHINA]	
XV. SOUTH INDIA	
71. Statement drawn up by Thirty-three Ministers of the Anglican and South India United Churches at Tranquebar. May 1919	122

Contents

ix

72. Statement from the Malabar Suffragan and other Members of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church. June 1919	125
[XVI. IRELAND]	
[XVII. NEW ZEALAND]	
[XVIII. WALES]	
[XIX. THE WEST INDIES]	
XX. REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM	
89. Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Archbishops and Metropolitans of the Anglican Communion. Christmas 1923	130
XXI. THE CONVERSATIONS AT MALINES	
90. Letter from Cardinal Mercier to his Clergy, January 1924	141
<i>See also Documents 112-13</i>	
<i>From</i> SECOND SERIES	
I. THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER	
91. Preamble. Unanimously adopted by the full Conference. August 1927	158
92. The Call to Unity. Unanimously adopted by the full Conference. August 1927	159
93. The Church's Message to the World—the Gospel. Report of Section II received by the full Conference, <i>nem. con.</i> August 1927	160
94. The Nature of the Church. Report of Section III received by the full Conference, <i>nem. con.</i> August 1927	162
95. The Church's Common Confession of Faith. Report of Section IV received by the full Conference, <i>nem. con.</i> August 1927	165
96. The Ministry of the Church. Report of Section V received by the full Conference, <i>nem. con.</i> August 1927	166
97. The Sacraments. Report of Section VI received by the full Conference, <i>nem. con.</i> August 1927	170
98. Foreword to the Report on Subject VII	172
99. The Unity of Christendom and the Relation thereto of existing Churches. Report on Subject VII presented with amendments to the Business Committee, and submitted to the Churches. December 1927	174
100. Concluding Statement. Drafted by the Chairman of the Conference at its request. August 1927	180
101. Declaration on behalf of the Eastern Orthodox Church. Read in English by Archbishop Germanos, Metropolitan of Thyateira, to the full session of the	

	World Conference, prior to the discussion of Reports VI and VII. August 18, 1927 . . .	182
II. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH		
112.	Question concerning Conferences (as is alleged) to promote the Unity of all Christian People. August 1927 . . .	187
113.	Encyclical Letter (<i>Mortalium Animos</i>) of His Holiness Pope Pius XI on fostering True Religious Union. January 6, 1928 . . .	188
III. THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCHES		
114.	Anglican Ordinations. Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury from the Archbishop of Utrecht. June 1925 . . .	201
115.	Anglican Ordinations. Letter to the Archbishop of Utrecht from the Archbishop of Canterbury. July 1925 . . .	202
IV. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE FREE CHURCHES		
	(Further proceedings of the Joint Conference held at Lambeth Palace, 1921-5)	
118.	A Memorandum on A Constitutional Episcopate. Adopted by the Joint Conference. July 11, 1924 . . .	204
119.	The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England. Resolution adopted by the Annual Assembly. September 16, 1924 . . .	208
120.	A Preliminary Statement by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Moderator of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England. June 19, 1925 . . .	209
121.	A Second Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry. Presented on behalf of the Church of England Representatives on the Joint Conference, together with an Appended Note from the Free Church Members of the Joint Conference. June 19, 1925 . . .	213
122.	A Memorandum by the Bishop of Truro and the Rev. A. E. Garvie, D.D., with reference to the question, 'What is meant by a Representative and Constitutional Episcopate, and how the Elements of Presbyteral and Congregational Order may be combined with it?' Generally approved by the Joint Conference. June 19, 1925 . . .	223
123.	A short Memorandum on the Relation of the Free Churches to Communions with which they are in Fellowship in other parts of the World. Adopted by the Joint Conference. June 19, 1925 . . .	230
124.	A Short Memorandum on the Problems connected with the Union between Church and State. Adopted by the Joint Conference. June 19, 1925. . .	231
125.	A Short Memorandum on the Safeguarding of the	

Contents

xi

Evangelical Principles of the Reformation. Adopted by the Joint Conference. June 19, 1925	233
126. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England. Resolutions adopted by the Annual Assembly. September 21-3, 1925	234
V. THE MORAVIAN CHURCH (<i>UNITAS FRATRUM</i>)	
132. A Memorandum from the Moravian Committee on certain points raised by the Lambeth Resolutions 1920. December 31, 1920	240
133. Reply of the Committee appointed by the Arch- bishop of Canterbury. May 2, 1921	245
134. A Memorandum from the Moravian Committee to the Archbishop's Committee. June 1922	248
135. A Letter from the Archbishop's Committee to the Moravian Committee. December 12, 1922	251
136. Reply of the Moravian Committee to the Arch- bishop's Committee's letter	257
137. Letter from the Archbishop's Committee to the Moravian Committee. November 26, 1923	261
138. Final Letter from the Moravian Committee to the Archbishop's Committee. March 31, 1924	262
[VI. SOUTH INDIA]	
VII. THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK	
144. The Message of the Conference. Stockholm, August 1925	266

I. THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE 1920

1. 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 fullness 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.

2. Resolutions (10-16) on the Reunion of Christendom

10. The Conference recommends to the authorities of the Churches of the Anglican Communion that they 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 concerning the possibility of taking definite steps to co-operate in a common endeavour, on the lines set forth in the above Appeal, to restore the unity of the Church of Christ.

11. The Conference recognizes that the task of effecting union with other Christian Communion must be undertaken by the various national, regional, or provincial authorities of the Churches within the Anglican Communion, and confidently commits to them the carrying out of this task on lines that are in general harmony with the principles underlying its Appeal and Resolutions.

12. The Conference approves the following statements as representing the counsel which it is prepared to give to the Bishops, Clergy, and other members of our own Communion on various subjects which bear upon the problems of reunion, provided that such counsel is not to be regarded as calling in question any Canons or official declarations of any Synod or House of Bishops of a national, regional, or provincial Church which has already dealt with these matters.

(A) In view of prospects and projects of reunion—

(i) 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 :

(ii) The Bishops of the Anglican Communion will not question the action of any Bishop who, in the few years between the initiation and the completion of a definite scheme of union, shall countenance the irregularity of admitting to Communion the baptized but unconfirmed Communicants of the non-episcopal congregations concerned in the scheme :

(iii) The Conference gives its general approval to the suggestions contained in the report of the Sub-Committee on Reunion with Non-Episcopal Churches in reference to the status and work of ministers who may remain after union without episcopal ordination (see pages 142 and 143.)¹

(B) *Believing, however, that certain lines of action might imperil both the attainment of its ideal and the unity of its own Communion, the Conference declares that—*

(i) It cannot approve of general schemes of inter-communion or exchange of pulpits :

(ii) In accordance with the principle of Church order set forth in the Preface to the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer, it 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 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.

(C) *In view of doubts and varieties of practice which have caused difficulties in the past, the Conference declares that—*

(i) 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.

(ii) In cases in which it is impossible for the Bishop's judgement to be obtained beforehand the priest should remember that he has no canonical authority to refuse Communion to any baptized person kneeling before the Lord's Table (unless he be excommunicate by name, or,

¹ *Report of Lambeth Conference 1920.* In this volume pp. 9, 10.

in the canonical sense of the term, a cause of scandal to the faithful); and that, if a question may properly be raised as to the future admission of any such person to Holy Communion, either because he has not been confirmed or for other reasons, the priest should refer the matter to the Bishop for counsel or direction.

13. The Conference recommends that, wherever 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 extension of the rule of Christ among all nations and over every region of human life.

14. It is important to the cause of reunion that every branch of the Anglican Communion should develop the constitutional government of the Church and should make a fuller use of the capacities of its members for service.

15. The Conference urges on every branch of the Anglican Communion that it should prepare its members for taking their part in the universal fellowship of the re-united Church, by setting before them the loyalty which they owe to the universal Church, and the charity and understanding which are required of the members of so inclusive a society.

16. We desire to express our 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. In particular, the Conference has heard with sympathetic and hopeful interest of the preliminary meeting of the proposed World Conference on Faith and Order about to be held at Geneva and earnestly prays that its deliberations may tend towards the reunion of the Christian Church.

3. *Suggestions¹ of the Sub-Committee on Reunion with Non-Episcopal Churches*

(EXTRACTS FROM REPORT OF LAMBETH CONFERENCE,
1920, pp. 142, 143)

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-

¹ See Lambeth Conference 1920, Resolution 12A (iii), p. 7 *supra*.

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.

II. WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER

[The World Conference on Faith and Order was originally proposed by the American Episcopal Church at its General Convention in 1910. A Joint Commission of that Church was then appointed to bring about a Conference and to invite all Christian Communion to unite in arranging for such Conference. The Joint Commission was continued by the Conventions of 1913, 1916, 1919 and 1922. A Preliminary Meeting of the World Conference was held at Geneva in August 1920 at which all the great groups of Trinitarian Churches except the Church of Rome were represented. It has been provisionally decided that the World Conference itself should be held in 1927]

4. The Original Suggestion

(From the official 'List of Commissions Already Appointed': published by the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order, December 20, 1922.)

A Joint Committee of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, held in Cincinnati, Ohio, in the United States of America, in October, A. D. 1910, made the following report :

'Your Committee is of one mind. We believe that the time has now arrived when representatives of the whole family of Christ, led by the Holy Spirit, may be willing to come together for the consideration of questions of Faith and Order. We believe further, that all Christian Communion are in accord with us in our desire to lay aside self-will, and to put on the mind which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. We would heed this call of the Spirit of God in all lowliness, and with singleness of purpose. We would place ourselves by the side of our fellow Christians, looking not only on our own things, but also on the things of

others, convinced that our one hope of mutual understanding is in taking personal counsel together in the spirit of love and forbearance. It is our conviction that such a Conference for the purpose of study and discussion, without power to legislate or to adopt resolutions, is the next step toward unity.

‘ With grief for our aloofness in the past, and for other faults of pride and self-sufficiency, which make for schism ; with loyalty to the truth as we see it, and with respect for the convictions of those who differ from us ; holding the belief that the beginnings of unity are to be found in the clear statement and full consideration of those things in which we differ, as well as of those things in which we are at one, we respectfully submit the following resolution :

‘ WHEREAS, There is to-day among all Christian people a growing desire for the fulfilment of our Lord’s prayer that all His disciples may be one ; that the world may believe that God has sent Him :

‘ RESOLVED, That a Joint Commission be appointed to bring about a Conference for the consideration of questions touching Faith and Order, and that all Christian Communion throughout the world which confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour be asked to unite with us in arranging for and conducting such a Conference. The Commission shall consist of seven Bishops, appointed by the Chairman of the House of Bishops, and seven Presbyters and seven Laymen, appointed by the President of the House of Deputies, and shall have power to add to its number and to fill any vacancies occurring before the next General Convention.’

The report was accepted joyfully by the Convention, and the resolution contained therein was adopted unanimously.

III. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH¹

10. *Letter transmitting the Lambeth Appeal to His Holiness Pope Benedict XV together with Reply*

(May 1921)

Lambeth Palace.

S.E. 1.

3rd May 1921.

MY LORD CARDINAL,

I am directed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to send herewith to your Eminence, in order that it may be duly placed in the hands of His Holiness the Pope, a copy of the Encyclical Letter and Report recently published on behalf of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion throughout the world.

I have the honour to be,

Your Eminence's obedient servant,

G. K. A. BELL,

His Eminence,

Chaplain.

The Cardinal Secretary of State,

The Vatican, Rome.

[*Explanatory Note*]

The Archbishop of Canterbury has the honour to transmit herewith to His Holiness the Pope, with much respect, a copy of the Encyclical Letter and Report issued last Autumn by the Conference of Anglican Bishops which met at Lambeth. A copy of this document was sent immediately on the conclusion of the Conference to His Eminence Cardinal Bourne as the chief representative in England of

¹ For an account of certain conversations between Roman Catholic and Anglican divines under the presidency of Cardinal Mercier at Malines, see the Archbishop of Canterbury's *Letter to the Archbishops and Metropolitans of the Anglican Communion*, p. 130.

the Roman Catholic Church. In accordance, however, with the wish expressed by many Bishops and others the Archbishop of Canterbury has the honour to enclose a copy to His Holiness the Pope, together with a Latin version of the Appeal to All Christian People which forms an important part of the Resolutions of the Conference, and which is obviously of interest and importance to the authorities of the Church of Christ throughout the world.

Lambeth Palace, S.E. 1.

3rd May 1921.

[REPLY]

Rome, 21 May 1921.

Segretario Di Stato,
Di Sua Santità.

The Cardinal Secretary of State presents his compliments to the Rev. G. K. A. Bell, and begs him to thank the Archbishop of Canterbury for his courtesy in sending a copy of the Encyclical Letter and Report of the Lambeth Conference which the Cardinal Secretary of State has had the honour of presenting to the Holy Father.

Rev. G. K. A. Bell, Chaplain.

*II. Extract from Encyclical Letter of His
Holiness Pope Pius XI (Ubi Arcano Dei)*

TO THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS,
AND OTHER ORDINARIES IN PEACE AND COMMUNION WITH
THE HOLY SEE ON THE PEACE OF CHRIST TO BE SOUGHT
IN THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST

(December 23, 1922)

RELIGIOUS UNION

From this Apostolic centre of the fold of Christ Our look turns next to the many who, either not knowing Christ or not fully holding His teaching or the unity

established by Him, are still outside the fold, though destined for it by Divine Providence. The Vicar of the Divine Shepherd cannot but repeat and make his own the words which, with their simple brevity, are redolent of love and tender pity: 'Them also [the other sheep] must I bring,' and must rejoice, too, in the happy prophecy of Christ Himself: 'And they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd' (John x, 16).

May God soon bring it to pass, as We and all of you and all the faithful earnestly pray, that that consummation may bring the fulfilment of the tender and assured prophecy of the Divine Heart.

And there has been seen what may be regarded as good augury for this religious unity: a thing of which you, Venerable Brethren, are well aware, generally unexpected indeed and perhaps to some a source of no special joy, but surely bringing pleasure to Us and to you—the fact, that is, that the representatives and rulers of almost all the States of the world, as if moved by a common instinct and desire of peace, have turned to this Apostolic See either to resume old friendly relations or to inaugurate such relations of concord. And this gives Us pleasure, not only on account of the increased authority of the Church, but also on account of the greater glory of its beneficence and the experience given to all of its inestimable virtues—which it, the Church of God, alone possesses—in bringing to human society all prosperity, including civil earthly well-being. For if indeed its direct object is, by Divine command, spiritual and eternal blessings, still, by the close connexion of things, it helps the earthly prosperity of individuals and society as well as if it was instituted for no other end.

And if the Church does not think it right to interfere without just reason in such earthly and purely political affairs, still, with full right, it cannot tolerate that the political power shall take excuse therefrom either to oppose

the good of the higher order, on which depends the salvation of souls, or to harass it by unjust laws or decrees, or to violate the Divine constitution of the Church itself, or to trample on the laws of God Himself among civil society.

IV. THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH

13. *Encyclical Letter from the Patriarchate of Constantinople*

UNTO ALL THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST WHERESOEVER
THEY BE

(January 1920)

' See that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently.'
(1 Pet. i. 22.)

Our Church is of opinion that a closer intercourse with each other and a mutual understanding between the several Christian Churches is not prevented by the doctrinal differences existing between them, and that such an understanding is highly desirable and necessary, and in many ways useful in the well-conceived interest of each one of the Churches taken apart and as a whole Christian body, as also for preparing and facilitating the complete and blessed union which may some day be attained with God's help. Our Church, therefore, deems the present time most opportune for bringing forth and considering this important question in common. For although, owing to old prejudices, traditions, and even pretensions, it is probable that there may even now arise or be brought forward the same difficulties which have so often frustrated the work of union, nevertheless, seeing that it is now a question of a mere contact and understanding, the difficulties, in our mind, will in any case be less serious, and if there be a good will and disposition, neither can they nor should they constitute an invincible and insuperable obstacle.

We therefore, on the establishment of the League of Nations, which has now been effected with good omen,

consider the matter to be both feasible and more than ever timely, and we beg, full of hope, herein to state summarily our thoughts and opinions as to the way in which we conceive this intercourse and understanding, and how we consider it possible, and we earnestly seek and invite the judgement and opinion thereon both of the other brothers in the East and of the venerable Christians of the Churches in the West wheresoever they be.

We accordingly think that the following two things can most greatly contribute to the attainment of such a desirable and useful intercourse, and to its accomplishment and public manifestation :

And first of all we deem as necessary and indispensable the removal of all mutual distrust and friction between the various Churches caused by the tendency, to be seen among some of them, to entice and convert followers of other confessions. For no one ignores what is taking place, unfortunately, even now disturbing the internal peace of the Churches, and especially those in the East, on which new afflictions and trials are thus brought through their own co-religionists ; and how great, as compared with the trifling results obtained, is the hatred and antagonism produced by this tendency on the part of some to proselytize and entice the followers of other Christian confessions. And that sincerity and, above all, confidence may be restored between the Churches, we consider it as most important that love between the Churches should be revived and strengthened, so that they may no longer look upon each other as strangers and enemies, but as relatives and friends in Christ, as ' fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel ' (Eph. iii. 6). And when the several Churches are inspired by love, and place it before everything else, in their judgement of the others and in relation to one another, they will then be able, instead of increasing

and widening the existing dissensions, to lessen and diminish the same as far as possible ; and by promoting a constant brotherly interest in the condition, the stability, and the prosperity of other Churches, by their eagerness in watching what is happening in those Churches, and by obtaining a more accurate knowledge of them, and by their readiness to give help and assistance, whenever occasion arises, they will do and achieve many good things to the glory and profit both of themselves and of the whole Christian body, and will advance the matter of the union.

And this friendship and kindly disposition toward each other can, to our mind, be demonstrated and more especially proved in the following manner :

(*a*) By acceptance of a uniform calendar for a simultaneous celebration of all the great Christian feasts by all the Churches ; (*b*) by the exchange of brotherly letters on the great feasts of the ecclesiastical year, when it is customary so to do, and on other exceptional occasions ; (*c*) by a more friendly intercourse between the representatives of the various Churches wherever they be ; (*d*) by an intercourse between theological schools and the representatives of theological science ; and by the exchange of theological and ecclesiastical periodicals and works published in each Church ; (*e*) by the exchange of students between the seminaries of the different Churches ; (*f*) by convening pan-Christian conferences to examine questions of common interest to all Churches ; (*g*) by the impartial and more historical examination of doctrinal differences, both from the chair and in theological treatises ; (*h*) by mutually respecting the customs and usages prevailing in each Church ; (*i*) by allowing to each other the use of places of prayer and of cemeteries for the funeral and burial of persons belonging to other confessions dying in foreign lands ; (*j*) by the settlement of the question of mixed marriages between the various confessions ; (*k*) and,

finally, by the mutual support of the Churches in the work of strengthening religious relief, of charity, and the like.

Such a frank and vivid intercourse between the Churches will be all the more beneficial to the whole body of the Church, as many dangers threaten no longer any particular Church, but all of them generally, because these dangers attack the very foundation of the Christian faith and the very composition of Christian life and society. For the terrible World War which has just come to an end, as it has brought to light many unhealthy things in the life of Christian Nations, and revealed in many cases a great absence of respect for the very principle of justice and humanity, so, too, it has not only made old wounds worse, but, so to speak, opened new ones of a more practical character, and with regard to which great attention and care is naturally needed on the part of all Churches. The daily advance of alcoholism ; the increase of superfluous luxury under the pretext of rendering life more beautiful and more enjoyable ; the voluptuousness and lust hardly covered by the cloak of freedom and emancipation of the flesh ; the prevailing unchecked licentious indecency in literature, painting, the theatre, and in music, bearing the respectable name of development of good taste and cultivation of fine art ; the deification of wealth and the contempt of higher ideals ; all these and the like, as they produce serious dangers to the constitution of Christian societies, are questions of the day, requiring and calling for a common study and co-operation on the part of the Christian Churches.

Finally, it is the duty of the Churches which adorn themselves with the sacred name of Christ not to forget and neglect any longer His new and great commandment of love, and still to fall piteously behind the political authorities, who, truly applying the spirit of the Gospel and of the Justice of Christ, have under happy auspices already instituted the League of Nations, for the defence of right

and for the cultivation of love and harmony among the nations.

For all these reasons, hoping that the other Churches would share our thoughts and opinions as above stated on the need of promoting such a co-operation and intercourse between the Churches, at least as a beginning, we request each one of them to make known to us its thoughts and opinions thereon in reply, so that after defining the goal by common consent and agreement, we may safely proceed together to its realization, and thus 'speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ; from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.'—(Eph. iv. 15, 16).

At the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the month of January in the year of Grace one thousand nine hundred and twenty.

The Locum Tenens of the Patriarchal Oecumenical Throne : Metropolitan of Brussa : DOROTHEUS.

The Metropolitan of Caesaria : NICOLAUS.

„ „ „ Cyzicus : CONSTANTINUS.

„ „ „ Amassia : GERMANUS.

„ „ „ Pissidia : GERASSIMUS.

„ „ „ Angyra : GERVASIUS.

„ „ „ Aenos : JOACHIM.

„ „ „ Vizya : ANTHIMUS.

„ „ „ Silivris : EUGENIUS.

„ „ „ Saranta Ecclesias :

AGATHANGELUS.

„ „ „ Tyroloe and Serentium :

CHRYSOSTOM

„ „ „ Dardanelles and Lampsacos :

EIRENAEUS.

17. *Terms of Intercommunion suggested between
the Church of England and the Churches in
Communion with her and the Eastern Orthodox
Church*

[These terms were drawn up at the request of the Eastern Churches Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and are now (1921) published at their request in the hope that they may facilitate further consideration of the whole question.]

I

Of the Christian Faith

We accept the Faith of Christ as it is taught us by the Holy Scriptures, and as it has been handed down to us in the Creed of the Catholic Church,¹ and as it is expounded in the dogmatic decisions of the Oecumenical Councils as accepted by the Undivided Church.

II

Of the Canon of Scripture

We accept the Canon of Scripture as it is defined by St. Athanasius,² and as it has been received by the whole Catholic Church; namely, the twenty-two books of the Old Testament which are contained in the Hebrew Canon, and the twenty-seven books of the New Testament. As regards the other books, which are called sometimes Deutero-canonical, sometimes *Ἀγαγινωσκόμενα*, sometimes *Apocrypha*, we also accept the teaching of St. Athanasius: 'for greater exactness I add this also . . . that there are other books besides these [books], not indeed included in the Canon, but appointed by the Fathers to be read by those who newly join us, and wish to be instructed in the word of

¹ See Section IV.

² *Festal Epistle xxxix.*

godliness . . . the former [books] . . . being included in the Canon, the latter being [only] read ' ;¹ and the teaching of St. Jerome ' that the Church may read them for the edification of the people, not for the confirmation of the authority of ecclesiastical dogmas ' .²

III

Of the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture

We believe that Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation, as St. Athanasius says, ' The sacred and inspired Scriptures are sufficient to declare the truth. ' ³ And elsewhere, ' These are the fountains of salvation, that he who thirsts may be satisfied with the oracles contained in them. In these [books] alone is proclaimed the doctrine of godliness. Let no man add to them, nor take aught from them ' ;⁴ and, as St. Augustine says : ' In those things which are plainly laid down in Scripture all things are found which comprise faith and morals ' .⁵ As

¹ S. Ath. *Ep. Fest* xxxix (ed. Bened., Paris, 1698, ii. p. 962) : ἀλλ' ἕνεκά γε πλείονος ἀκριβείας προστίθημι καὶ τοῦτο γράφων ἀναγκαίως, ὡς ὅτι ἔστι καὶ ἕτερα βιβλία τούτων ἔξωθεν, οὐ κανονιζόμενα μὲν, τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τοῖς ἄρτι προσερχομένοις καὶ βουλομένοις κατηχεῖσθαι τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον . . . καὶ ὅμως, ἀγαπητοί, κἀκείνων κανονιζομένων καὶ τούτων ἀναγινωσκομένων κτλ.

² *Prol in Libros Salom.* : Sicut ergo Iudith et Machabaeorum libros legit quidem Ecclesia, sed eos inter canonicas Scripturas non recepit, sic et haec duo volumina [Ecclesiasticum et Sapientiam] legat ad aedificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam.

³ S. Ath. *contra Gentes* i § 3 : αὐτάρκεις μὲν γάρ εἰσιν αἱ ἅγαι καὶ θεόπνευστοι γραφαὶ πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπαγγελίαν. Cp. *de Synod.* 6, ad *Episc. Aegypti.* 6

⁴ S. Ath. *Ep. Fest* xxxix : ταῦτα πηγαὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου, ὥστε τὸν διψῶντα ἐν τούτοις ἐμφορεῖσθαι λόγιον· ἐν τούτοις μόνοις τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας διδασκαλείον εὐαγγελίζεται· μηδεὶς τούτοις ἐπιβαλλέτω, μηδὲ τούτων ἀφαιρέσθω τι.

⁵ S. Aug. *de Doctrina Christiana*, ii. 9 : in eis enim quae aperte in Scripturis positae sunt inveniuntur illa omnia quae continent fidem, moresque vivendi, spem scilicet atque caritatem.

touching Tradition, we accept it, in the words of the *Longer Catechism* of the Russian Church, ' as a guide to the right understanding of Holy Scripture, for the right ministrations of the Sacraments, and the preservation of sacred rites and ceremonies in the purity of their original institution ' ; and ' we must follow that tradition which agrees with the divine revelation and with Holy Scripture ' .¹

IV

Of the Creed of the Church

We accept as the creed of the Catholic Church that which is sometimes called the Creed of Constantinople, and in the formularies of the Church of England is called the Nicene Creed ; which was put forth by the Council of Chalcedon and has been accepted by the whole Catholic Church.

V

Of the Exposition of Faith of the Council of Chalcedon

We accept also as explaining the Creed the Exposition of Faith which was put forth by the Council of Chalcedon.

VI

That no one may put forth any other Creed

Whereas it is stated in the Exposition of faith of the Council of Chalcedon that ' these things having been defined by us with all possible accuracy and care, the Holy and Oecumenical Synod hath decreed that it is unlawful for any one to present, or compile, or compose, or believe, or teach to others, any other creed ; and that those who dare either to compose another creed, or to bring forward, or to

¹ *Longer Catechism*. English Translation in *The Doctrine of the Russian Church*. By the Rev. R. W. Blackmore (Aberdeen, 1845), p. 36.

teach, or to deliver another symbol to those wishing to turn from paganism or from Judaism or from heresy of what sort soever, to the full knowledge of the truth, these, if bishops or clerics, be deposed, the bishops from the episcopate and clerics from the clerical office ; and, if monks or laics, they be anathematized ' ¹ We recognize that it is unlawful for a Church to demand any further statement of faith as a necessary condition of intercommunion ; but that it is not unlawful for the several Churches to use as their baptismal creed some other creed agreeable to the tradition of the Church, as in the Western Church that which is called the Apostles' Creed is and always has been so used. Nor is it unlawful for a Church to use any other similar document in the services of the Church, or for the instruction of the Faithful, provided that it is agreeable to orthodox doctrine.

VII

Of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit

Whereas there has been a difference, as between the East and the West, in the language used concerning the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit, so that it has been the custom in the East to say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and in the West that He proceeds from the Father and the Son, we recognize that both forms of expression may rightly be used, and that they are intended to express the same faith. While we reject every conception or form of

¹ *Expos. fidei Conc. Chal.* (Mansi, *Concilia*, vii. 116): τούτων τοῖνυν μετὰ πάσης πανταχούθεν ἀκριβείας τε καὶ ἐμμελείας παρ' ἡμῶν διατυπωθέντων, ὤρισεν ἡ ἀγία καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ Σύνοδος ἐτέραν πίστιν μηδενὶ ἐξείναι προφέρειν ἤγουν συγγράφειν ἢ συντιθέναι ἢ φρονεῖν ἢ διδάσκειν ἐτέρουσ' τοῦσ δὲ τολμῶντας ἢ συντιθέναι πίστιν ἐτέραν ἤγουν προκομίζειν ἢ διδάσκειν ἢ παραδιδόναι ἕτερον σύμβολον τοῖσ ἐθέλουσιν ἐπιστρέφειν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐξ Ἑλληνισμοῦ ἢ ἐξ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ ἤγουν ἐξ αἰρέσεως οἰασθησοῦν, τούτους, εἰ μὲν εἶεν ἐπίσκοποι ἢ κληρικοί, ἀλλοτρίους εἶναι τοῦσ ἐπισκόπουσ τῆσ ἐπισκοπῆσ καὶ τοῦσ κληρικοῦσ τοῦ κλήρου, εἰ δὲ μονάζοντες ἢ λαϊκοὶ εἶεν ἀναθεματίζεσθαι αὐτοῦσ.

expression which implies the existence of two principles or ἀρχαί or αἰτίαι in the Holy Trinity, we accept the teaching of St. John of Damascus and of the earlier Greek Fathers that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father through the Son.¹

VIII

Of the Filioque Clause

And whereas in the Western Church at some time in the sixth or seventh century the words *Filioque* were added to the Creed, we agree in acknowledging that this addition was not made 'in an ecclesiastically regular manner'; and that in assemblies of Easterns and Westerns the one Creed of the Universal Church ought to be recited without those words; but we are also agreed that, since the added words are used in an orthodox sense, it is lawful for any Church which has received the Creed as containing these words to continue so to recite it in the Services of the Church.

IX

Of Variety of Customs in the Church

St. Augustine divides the usages of the Church into three classes: viz. (1) those customs which have the authority of our Lord and of the Scriptures, of which he says 'Our Lord Jesus Christ has put us under a light yoke and an easy burden as He says Himself in the Gospel; and therefore He has bound together the society of the New People by sacraments in number very few, in observance most easy, and in meaning most excellent: as Baptism consecrated in

¹ On the *Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* and the *Filioque* clause see the extract from the Report of the Bonn Conference of 1875, printed in Appendix I. This Report was carefully examined by a committee of the province of Canterbury in 1875. See Occasional Paper of the *Eastern Church Association*, No. X, Parker, Oxford, 1904, to be obtained from the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association.

the Name of the Trinity, the Communion of His Body and Blood, and anything else that is commended in the Canonical Scriptures'; (2) 'those things which we hold on the authority, not of Scripture, but of tradition, which are observed throughout the whole world', and of these he says it is to be understood that they are retained 'as commended and enacted either by the Apostles themselves or by plenary Councils whose authority in the Church is most salutary'; and (3) 'those things which are different in different places and countries. . . . All such things are free to be observed or not; and there is no better rule for a serious and prudent Christian than to act in such wise as he sees that church to act in which he chances to find himself'¹ The Patriarch Photius also writes: 'In cases where the thing disregarded is not matter of faith and does not involve a falling away from any general or catholic decree, where different customs and usages are observed in different places, a man who knows how to judge would be right in deciding that neither do those who observe them

¹ S. Aug. *Ep. liv ad Ianuarium* 1-3: Primo itaque tenere te volo quod est huius disputationis caput: Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, sicut Ipse in Evangelio loquitur, leni iugo suo nos subdidisse et sarcinae levi: unde sacramentis numero paucissimis, observatione facillimis, significatione praestantissimis, societatem Novi Populi colligavit, sicut est Baptismus Trinitatis nomine consecratus, Communicatio Corporis et Sanguinis Ipsius, et si quid aliud in Scripturis canonicis commendatur, exceptis iis quae servitutum populi veteris . . . onerabant. . . . Illa autem quae non scripta sed tradita custodimus, quae quidem toto terrarum orbe servantur, datur intelligi vel ab ipsis Apostolis vel plenariis Conciliis, quorum est in Ecclesia saluberrima auctoritas, commendata atque statuta retineri. . . . Alia vero quae per loca terrarum regionesque variantur. . . . totum hoc genus rerum liberas habet observationes: nec disciplina ulla est in his melior gravi prudentique Christiano quam ut eo modo agat quo agere viderit ecclesiam ad quam forte devenerit. Quod enim neque contra fidem neque contra bonos mores esse convincitur, indifferenter est habendum et propter eorum inter quos vivitur societatem servandum est. Cp S. Ath. *de Synodis* 5.

act wrongly, nor those who have not received them break the law'.¹ We agree, therefore, to recognize those customs which have the authority of our Lord, of Scripture, and of the Universal Church ; while, as to those which are different in different parts of the Christian world and for which there is not the authority of Scripture or of any general Council, we agree that each Church do retain its own customs.

X

Of the Number of the Sacraments

Inasmuch as the number of the Sacraments has never been authoritatively fixed either by tradition from the Apostles or any decision of an Oecumenical Council, their number has been differently reckoned in the Church at different periods. It was not until the sixteenth century that the number was defined in the Roman Church, or until the seventeenth century in the Eastern. We recognize that the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist are pre-eminent above the rest.² In the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England the title Sacrament is only

¹ 'Εν οἷς οὐκ ἔστι πίστις τὸ ἀθετούμενον, οὐδὲ κοινῷ τε καὶ καθολικοῦ ψηφίσματος ἔκπτωσις, ἄλλων παρ' ἄλλοις ἐθῶν τε καὶ νομίμων φυλαττομένων, οὔτε τοὺς φύλακας ἀδικεῖν, οὔτε τοὺς μὴ παραδεχομένους παρανομεῖν, ὀρθῶς ἂν τις κρίνειν εἰδὼς διορίσαιτο (Φωτίου τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ ἀγιωτάτου Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Ἐπιστολαί, Βαλέττα, London, 1864, p. 156).

² The Patriarch Jeremiah in his second answer to the Protestants, 1576, writes : ' Ἄν γὰρ τὰ κυριώτερα τῶν μυστηρίων τὸ βάπτισμα καὶ κοινωνία ἢ θεία ἐστὶ, καὶ ἂν δίχα σωθῆναι ἀδύνατον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῦτα παρέδωκεν ἡ ἐκκλησία, τὰ λοιπὰ φημι ἄχρι τῶν ἑπτὰ, ὡς λέγομεν (Συμβολικὴ τῆς ὀρθοδόξου ἀνατολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὑπὸ I. E. Μεσολωρα, Athens, 1885, vol. i, p. 228).

So Kritopoulos in his Confession, published in 1661 (*Ὁμολογία Μητροφάνους τοῦ Κριτοπούλου*, ib. pp. 313, 314) distinguishes three Sacraments as necessary, Baptism, the Holy Communion (ἡ ἅγια κοινωνία), and Penance (ἡ μετάνοια). Besides these there are other rites, also called Sacraments, which ought to be received, παρὰ ταῦτα δὲ τὰ τρία ἀναγκαῖα μυστήρια εἰσὶ καὶ τινες τελεταὶ μυστικαὶ μυστήρια καλεῖναι ὁμωνύμως καλούμεναι παρὰ τῆ ἐκκλησίας διὰ τὸ μυστικὸν τε καὶ πνευματικὸν ταῦταις ἐμπεριέχεσθαι.

used of these two as (1) having an outward visible sign ordained by Christ Himself, and (2) as generally necessary for salvation.¹ But we agree further that the title Sacrament may be used of other rites and ceremonies in which there is an outward and visible sign and an inward and spiritual grace, and in that sense it is rightly used of other institutions, such as ordination, penance, confirmation, marriage, and the anointing of the sick ; and in relation to some of these Sacraments, since the customs of the different Churches have varied and still vary, we agree that each Church have liberty to retain its own usages.

XI

Of the Holy Eucharist

The Church has at all times desired to fulfil the Lord's command by the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, and we desire in all things to obey the teaching of Scripture and the regulations of the Universal Church. But whereas there has been much controversy, and many divisions have arisen, as to the more exact definition of the nature of the presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist ; and whereas there is no decree of any Oecumenical Council touching the manner of the presence of

οἶον τὸ μετὰ τὸ ἅγιον βάπτισμα εὐθὺς παραλαμβανόμενον ἅγιον χρίσμα, ἢ τῆς τῶν ἱερέων, ὁ πρῶτος γάμος καὶ τὸ εὐχέλσιον.

And the Patriarch Jeremiah in his reply to the Nonjurors (1718) says : ' We hold likewise that the Holy Sacraments are seven in number ; but two only exceed in necessity, and are such as no one can be saved without them. For, as for Baptism, it is our Lord's saying that *Whosoever is not born again of Water and the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of God.* And of the Eucharist, he says : *Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you.*' ' Reply of the Patriarchs to the Nonjurors ' in George Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1868), p. 46.

¹ Of the Sacraments, St. John Damascene treats only of Baptism and the Eucharist (*de Fide Orthodoxa*, iv. 9, 13).

Christ ; and whereas some of the terms that have been used have been used with different significations in different parts of the Church : we agree that this is a Divine Mystery which transcends human understanding, and that the Church has expressed sufficiently its belief in its Liturgies ; and we agree further that the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, as it is taught in the Liturgies of the Orthodox Church, and in the Liturgies of the Church of England and those of the Churches in communion with the Church of England, is adequate and sufficient.

XII

Of the Holy Orders of the Church

In order that the Word of God might be preached and the Sacraments duly administered our Lord instituted a Ministry for His Church and the Apostles ordained ministers by the laying on of hands with prayer, and the Catholic Church has laid down rules for the continuation and ordering of the Ministry. We desire always to fulfil the commands of Christ, the intention of the Apostles, and the rule of the Church. We agree that 'from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons'—and it has always been our intention that these Orders 'be continued and reverently used and esteemed';¹ and we agree that in accordance with our common usage and the canon of the Council of Nicaea every bishop be consecrated by three other bishops at least, and that all priests and deacons be ordained by bishops with the laying on of hands and prayer ; and that in Ordination the Holy Spirit is given for the work

¹ *The Form and Manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, according to the order of the Church of England*, Preface. Compare also the words used by the Bishops in the Lambeth Conference of 1908 and 1920 : 'We who speak are bearers of the sacred commission of the ministry given by our Lord through His Apostles to the Church.'

of the Ministry ; and we consider that the forms of Ordination used in the Orthodox Church and in the Church of England are adequate and sufficient.¹

XIII

Of the Sacred Icons

Since there has been much difference of opinion touching the use of Icons, and since there are differences of usage between the East and the West, we express our agreement with the Second Council of Nicaea that the tradition of 'making pictorial representations is agreeable to the history contained in the Evangelic Message, for a confirmation of the real incarnation of God the Word, and serves to our profit in this regard';² and we agree further that worship (*λατρεία*) pertains to the Divine Nature alone,³ and we accept the words used by the bishop at his consecration in the Russian Church: 'I will take care that the homage due to God be not transferred to holy images nor false miracles be ascribed to them whereby the true worship is perverted and a handle given to adversaries to reproach the Orthodox; on the contrary I will study that images be respected only in the sense of the Holy Orthodox Church as set forth in the Second Council of Nicaea.' And for other matters we agree that each Church may have liberty to preserve its own distinctive customs, and that in the Western Church figures of Christ and the Saints be allowed which are carved and sculptured contrary to the custom of

¹ See Appendix II.

² *Definitio Conc. Nicaen. II* (Mansi, *Concilia*, xiii. 377) Καὶ συνελόντες φαμὲν ἀπάσας τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς ἐγγράφως ἢ ἀγράφως τεθεοπισμέναις ἡμῖν παραδόσεις ἀκαινοτομήτως φυλάττομεν ὡν μία ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ τῆς εἰκονικῆς ἀναζωγραφῆσεως ἐκτύπωσις, ὡς τῇ ἱστορίᾳ τοῦ εὐαγγελικοῦ κηρύγματος συνᾶδουσα, πρὸς πίστωσιν τῆς ἀληθινῆς καὶ οὐ κατὰ φαντασίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου ἐνανθρωπήσεως, καὶ εἰς ὁμοίαν λυσιτέλειαν ἡμῖν χρησιμεύουσα.

³ *Ibid.* τὴν κατὰ πίστιν ἡμῶν ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν ἢ πρέπει μόνῃ τῇ θεΐᾳ φύσει.

the Eastern Church ; and that the Eastern Church should show reverence to the Sacred Icons in accordance with its own customs and the teaching of the Second Council of Nicaea ; and that neither Church should accuse the other of idolatry or false teaching.

APPENDIX I

Propositions adopted by the Bonn Conference

I

1. We agree in receiving the Oecumenical Creeds and dogmatic decisions of the ancient undivided Church.

2. We agree in acknowledging that the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed did not take place in an ecclesiastically regular manner.

3. We acknowledge on all sides the representation of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, as it is set forth by the Fathers of the undivided Church.

4. We reject every proposition and every method of expression in which in any way the acknowledgement of two principles or *ἀρχαί* or *αἰτίαι* in the Trinity may be contained.

II

We accept the teaching of St. John Damascene on the Holy Ghost, as it is expressed in the following paragraphs in the sense of the teaching of the ancient undivided Church.

1. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father, as the Beginning (*ἀρχή*), the Cause (*αἰτία*), the Source (*πηγή*), of the Godhead.¹

2. The Holy Ghost does not issue out of the Son (*ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ*), because there is in the Godhead but one Beginning (*ἀρχή*), one Cause (*αἰτία*), through which all that is in the Godhead is produced.²

¹ *De Recta Sententia*, n. 1 ; *Contr. Manich.* n. 4.

² Ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα οὐ λέγομεν, Πνεῦμα δὲ Υἱοῦ ὀνομάζομεν (*De Fide Orthod.* i. 8).

3. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father through the Son.¹

4. The Holy Ghost is the Image of the Son, who is the Image of the Father,² issuing out of the Father and resting in the Son as His revealing power.³

5. The Holy Ghost is the personal production out of the Father, belonging to the Son, but not out of the Son, because He is the Spirit of the mouth of God declarative of the Word.⁴

6. The Holy Ghost forms the link between the Father and the Son, and is linked to the Father by the Son.⁵

APPENDIX II

Formulae of Ordination

The following are the formulae of ordination in the Eastern and English Churches.

I. Presbyters.

Αὐτός, Δέσποτα τῶν ἀπάντων, καὶ τοῦτον ὄν εὐδόκησας προχειρισθῆναι παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐν ἀμέμπτῳ πολιτεία καὶ ἀκλινεῖ τῇ πίστι εὐδόκησον ὑποδέξασθαι τὴν μεγάλην ταύτην χάριν τοῦ

¹ Τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκφαντορικῆ τοῦ κρυφίου τῆς Θεότητος δύναμις τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐκ Πατρὸς μὲν δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευομένη (*De Fide Orthod.* i. 12). Υἱοῦ δὲ Πνεῦμα, οὐχ ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον (*Ibid.*). Διὰ τοῦ Λόγου αὐτοῦ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον (*Cont. Manich.* n. 5). Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ Λόγου προίον (*De Hymno Trisag.* n. 28). Τοῦτ' ἡμῖν ἐστι τὸ λατρευόμενον . . . Πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον· ὅπερ καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λέγεται, ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ φανερούμενον καὶ τῇ κτίσει μεταδιδόμενον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔχον τὴν ὑπαρξιν (*Hom. in Sabb. S.* n. 4).

² Εἰκὼν τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱός, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα (*De Fide Orthod.* i. 13).

³ Τοῦ Πατρὸς προερχομένη καὶ ἐν τῷ Λόγῳ ἀναπαυομένη καὶ αὐτοῦ αἴσαν ἐκφαντικὴν δύναμιν (*De Fide Orthod.* i. 7). Πατὴρ διὰ Λόγου προβολεὺς ἐκφαντορικοῦ Πνεύματος (*Ibid.* i. 12.)

⁴ Τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐνυπόστατον ἐκπόρευμα καὶ πρόβλημα ἐκ Πατρὸς μὲν, Υἱοῦ δέ, καὶ μὴ ἐξ Υἱοῦ, ὡς Πνεῦμα στόματος Θεοῦ, Λόγου ἐξαγγελτικόν (*De Hymno Trisag.* n. 28).

⁵ Μέσον τοῦ ἀγεννήτου καὶ γεννητοῦ, καὶ δι' Υἱοῦ τῷ Πατρὶ συναπτόμενον (*De Fide Orthod.* i. 13). The above translation is incorrect. It should be: 'The Holy Ghost is neither unbegotten nor begotten, and is linked to the Father by the Son.'

Ἀγίου σου Πνεύματος καὶ τέλειον ἀνάδειξον δοῦλόν σου ἐν πᾶσιν εὐαρεστοῦντα σοι καὶ ἀξίως πολιτευόμενον τῆς δωρηθείσης αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τῆς σῆς προγνωστικῆς δυνάμεως μεγάλης ταύτης ἱερατικῆς τιμῆς.

Αὐτὸς Κύριε καὶ τοῦτον ὃν εὐδόκησας τὸν τοῦ Πρεσβυτερίου ὑπεισηλθεῖν βαθμὸν πλήρωσον τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος δωρεᾶς· ἵνα γένηται ἄξιος παρεστάναι ἀμέμπτως τῷ Θεοσιαστηρίῳ σου, κηρύσσειν τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας σου, ἱεουργεῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας σου, προσφέρειν σοι δῶρα καὶ θυσίας πνευματικῆς, ἀνακαινίζειν τὸν λαόν σου διὰ τῆς τοῦ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας.

Receive the Holy Ghost, for the Office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven: And whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of his Holy Sacraments; In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.¹

2. Bishop.

Αὐτός, Δέσποτα τῶν ἀπάντων, καὶ τοῦτον τὸν ψηφισθέντα καὶ ἀξιωθέντα ὑπεισελθεῖν τὸν εὐαγγελικὸν ζυγόν, καὶ τὴν ἀρχιερατικὴν ἀξίαν, διὰ τῆς χειρὸς ἐμοῦ τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ καὶ τῶν συμπαρόντων Λειτουργῶν καὶ Συνεπισκόπων, τῇ ἐπιφοιτήσει καὶ δυνάμει καὶ χάριτι τοῦ ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος ἐνίσχυσον, κτλ.

Receive the Holy Ghost, for the Office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands, In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. And remember that thou stir up the Grace of God which is given thee, by this imposition of our hands: For God hath not given us the spirit of fear: but of power, and love, and soberness.²

¹ These are the words used at the laying on of hands; they are preceded by the prayers 'Almighty God, giver of all good things' and 'Almighty God and heavenly Father'.

² These words are preceded in the service by three prayers, 'Almighty God, who by thy Son', 'Almighty God, giver of all good things', and 'Almighty God and most merciful Father'.

19. *Constantinople and Anglican Ordinations*

LETTER OF THE OECUMENICAL PATRIARCH TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

[The Archbishop of Canterbury in officially communicating the two following documents to Canterbury Convocation on February 16, 1923, pointed out that to become an oecumenical act the formal acceptance of Anglican Ordinations would have to be endorsed by all Patriarchates and other independent autocephalous Churches severally, or by a General Council. He further stated that the Declaration did not by itself authorize intercommunion or mutual ministrations. 'The importance', he said, 'lies in the preparation thus made by the Declaration for future advances,' and 'in preparing the way for the possible regularization of Anglican ministrations to their [i. e. Orthodox] people, or of the offer of ministrations on their part.']

Most Reverend Archbishop of Canterbury and Chief Hierarch of all England, Brother, beloved and yearned for in Christ our God, Lord Randall, greetings ; your Reverence well beloved by us, fraternally in the Lord, we address you with gladness.

Our special committee dealing with the Union of the Churches has drawn our attention and that of our Holy Synod to the question of the validity of Anglican ordinations from the Orthodox point of view, for that it would be profitable in regard to the whole question of union that the opinion of the Holy Orthodox Church should be known upon this matter.

Accordingly the Holy Synod on this opportunity taking under our presidency the matter under consideration, and, having examined it from every point of view, has concluded that, as before the Orthodox Church, the ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal Confession of bishops, priests, and deacons, possesses the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic, and Armenian Churches possess, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them which are held indispensable from the Orthodox point of view for the recognition of the

'Charisma' of the priesthood derived from Apostolic Succession.

Indeed, on the one hand, it is plain that there is as yet no matter here of a decree by the whole Orthodox Church. For it is necessary that the rest of the Orthodox Churches should be found to be of the same opinion (in the matter) as the Most Holy Church of Constantinople.

But even so it is an event not without significance that the Synod of one, and that the Primatial Throne of the Orthodox Churches, when taking the matter into consideration, has come to this conclusion.

Therefore with great joy we communicate the matter to Your beloved Grace as the Chief Hierarchy of the whole Anglican Church, being sure that your Grace will be equally favourably disposed towards this conclusion, as recognizing in it a step forward in that work of general union which is dear to God.

May the Heavenly Father grant unto us to be of the same mind, through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for ever and ever.

July 28, 1922.

Your well-beloved Grace's beloved brother in Christ, and altogether well disposed,

✠ MELETIOS OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

[For this exact translation the Metropolitan of Thyateira, Germanos.]

20. *Encyclical on Anglican Ordinations*

FROM THE OECUMENICAL PATRIARCH TO THE PRESIDENTS
OF THE PARTICULAR EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCHES

(August 1922).

The Most Holy Church of Constantinople, kindled from the beginning with zeal for universal union, and always keeping in mind the Lord's words prayed by Him to His heavenly Father just before His Saving Passion, has always

followed with keen interest every movement in the separated Churches, and has examined with care and study their every and any expression of faith which might point towards a *rapprochement* with Orthodoxy. Further, it has concluded with real joy that amongst them the Church, which has manifested the most lively desire to remove the obstacles towards a *rapprochement*, and, indeed, to full union with the Orthodox Church, is the Episcopal Anglican Church, which herself, having first received the light of Christianity from the East, has never ceased to remember the East, and to account as an important end a sincere *rapprochement* towards a full union in Christ Jesus with the Orthodox in the East.

Therefore the great Church of Christ (now) under our presidency, necessarily honouring the readiness of this Church in former periods, and especially in the last twenty years, entered into many sincere brotherly relations with it, and recently established a special committee, with instructions to report upon the still existing points of difference on the basis of a scientific inquiry, and on the method of their removal, with a view to accomplishing a full union of the two Churches in the same Orthodox Christian spirit.

Perceiving in its labour that on an important question—namely, the validity of Anglican ordinations—the Holy Orthodox Church had not yet officially delivered any opinion either as a whole or through any of the particular Holy Synods, although there have been many discussions on the matter from time to time among her theologians, and that an authoritative investigation and canonical solution of this important question would greatly facilitate the desired union by removing one of the more serious obstacles that oppose the goal of reunion which is sought on either side, and is dear to God, the Committee brought under the judgement of our Holy Synod a special report scientifically treating the above-named question. Our

Holy Synod studied this report of the Committee in repeated sessions, and took note :

1. That the ordination of Matthew Parker as Archbishop of Canterbury by four bishops is a fact established by history.

2. That in this ordination and those subsequent to it there are found in their fullness those orthodox and indispensable visible and sensible elements of valid episcopal ordination—namely, the laying on of hands and the *Epiklesis* of the All-Holy Spirit, and also the purpose to transmit the *charisma* of the Episcopal ministry.

3. That the Orthodox theologians who have scientifically examined the question have almost unanimously come to the same conclusions, and have declared themselves as accepting the validity of Anglican ordinations.

4. That the practice in the Church affords no indication that the Orthodox Church has ever officially treated the validity of Anglican Orders as in doubt in such a way as would point to the reordination of the Anglican clergy being regarded as required in the case of the union of the two Churches.

5. That expressing this general mind of the Orthodox Church the Most Holy Patriarchs at different periods and other Hierarchs of the East, when writing to the Archbishops of the Anglican Church, have been used to address them as ' Most Reverend Brother in Christ ', thus giving them a brotherly salutation.

Our Holy Synod, therefore, came to an opinion accepting the validity of the Anglican priesthood, and has determined that its conclusion should be announced to the other Holy Orthodox Churches, in order that opportunity might be given them also to express their opinion, so that through the decisions of the parts the mind of the whole Orthodox world on this important question might be known.

Accordingly, writing to your well-beloved [Beatitude] and informing you of the considerations which, in this question,

prevail with us, we have no doubt that your [Beatitude] also investigating this question with your Holy Synod, will be pleased to communicate the result of your consideration to us, with a view to a further improvement of our relations in regard to union with the Anglican Church, in the good hope that the Heavenly Ruler of the Church will supply that which is lacking through His all-strengthening grace, and will guide all who believe in Him to a full knowledge of the truth and to full union, that there may be formed of them one flock under a Chief Shepherd—the true Shepherd of the sheep, our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory for ever. Amen.

VI. THE FREE CHURCHES IN ENGLAND AND THE LAMBETH APPEAL

44. *Church Unity*

BEING THE REPORT OF A JOINT CONFERENCE HELD AT LAMBETH PALACE, TOGETHER WITH A PRELIMINARY STATEMENT BY THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY AND YORK AND THE MODERATOR OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES, MAY 1922

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The time has, in our opinion, come when it is desirable that information should be made public as to the present outcome in this country of the 'Appeal to All Christian People', which was issued nearly two years ago by the Bishops attending the Lambeth Conference of 1920.

The Appeal was transmitted by the Archbishop of Canterbury in August 1920 to the different Christian Churches at home and abroad. On September 28, 1920, a provisional statement in reply was issued by the Federal

Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England at their annual meeting, and was endorsed by the National Free Church Council. In April 1921, a fuller statement from the same source was published under the title, 'The Free Churches and the Lambeth Appeal,' and in September 1921, as the result of detailed examination and discussion, the following resolution was passed:

'The Federal Council, having noted the suggestion of the Bishops that a central conference should be held between representatives of Episcopal and non-Episcopal communions upon the whole subject of the Appeal, and further desiring explication of expressions in the Appeal which are felt to have an ambiguous character, hereby appoints the following with a view to such conference with the two Archbishops and with other members of the Church of England whom they may appoint: *Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., D.D. (Moderator); Rev. Charles Brown, D.D.; Rev. W. T. Davison, M.A., D.D.; Sir Walter Essex; Rev. W. Y. Fullerton; *Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.; Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A.; Sir Alfred Pearce Gould, K.C.V.O., M.S.; Rev. A. J. Viner; Rev. S. Horton; Rev. H. Maldwyn Hughes, B.A., B.D.; *Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D.; Right Rev. Bishop Mumford; Rev. T. Nightingale; *Professor A. S. Peake, M.A., D.D.; Rev. Alex. Ramsay, D.D.; Right Hon. Walter Runciman; Rev. W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D.; Rev. J. Alfred Sharp; *Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson, M.A., D.D.; Right Hon. J. H. Whitley, M.P.; Rev. Henry Smith; Rev. W. Lewis Robertson, M.A., Rev. Walter H. Armstrong, and *Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, M.A., D.D., secretaries.'

With a view to the desired Conferences, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York nominated as representatives of the Church of England the Archbishop of Canterbury, *the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Winchester, *Gloucester, Ely, Lichfield, *Peterborough, Chelmsford,

Hereford, and *Ripon. *The Bishop of Salisbury was subsequently added, together with *Dr. Headlam, Regius Professor of Divinity of Oxford, and *Dr. Walter Frere.

On November 30, 1921, the Conference met at Lambeth Palace under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and after prolonged discussion appointed a committee of thirteen persons (six Church of England and six Free Churchmen) to consider, under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of York, some of the issues involving large questions of principle which had been raised during the Conference. The names of those who formed the committee are marked with an asterisk in the foregoing lists. This committee held prolonged meetings in Lambeth Palace in January, March, and April 1922, giving consideration chiefly to the three following subjects: (1) The nature of the Church; (2) The nature of the Ministry; (3) The place of Creeds in a United Church. The committee ultimately decided to present their report in the form of a series of propositions to which they had unanimously agreed. The Conference met at Lambeth Palace on May 24, 1922, to receive the report. The report was considered, and after full discussion the Conference unanimously gave its general approval to the several propositions in the form printed below.

The report must be submitted to the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, at whose request the Conference was arranged. But the members of the Conference who represent that Council concurred with the representatives of the Church of England in deciding that, without prejudice to any decision of the Council, the report should at once be made public for the information of the Churches represented in the Conference and of all Christian people. It will be understood that the propositions which the report contains are not intended as a complete statement of the great subjects with which they deal; nor even as expressing

what individual members of the Conference or the Churches which they represent might regard as a full statement of their own positions. They are submitted simply as expressing substantially the very large measure of agreement which, after full and frank discussion, the Conference had been enabled to reach.

It is obvious that many matters of great importance are not dealt with in this interim report. These must be the subject of future discussion. But the members of the Conference hope that the agreement which they have so far reached may prove to be a basis upon which, by God's help, further agreement leading to practical action may be built. Meanwhile, we would earnestly press upon all who have this great matter at heart that they should remember steadily, both in public and private prayer, the possibilities which, as we believe, God is opening to our view, in firm assurance that He will, in His own good time, show us the manner of their accomplishment.

RANDALL CANTUAR:

COSMO EBOR:

J. D. JONES, *Moderator of the*

May 29, 1922.

Federal Council.

THE REPORT AS ACCEPTED BY THE CONFERENCE

I. ON THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH

1. The foundation of the Church rests not upon the will or consent or beliefs of men, whether as individuals or as societies, but upon the creative Will of God.

2. The Church is the Body of Christ, and its constitutive principle is Christ Himself, living in His members through His Spirit.

3. As there is but one Christ, and one Life in Him, so there is and can be but one Church.

4. This one Church consists of all those who have been, or are being, redeemed by and in Christ, whether in this world or in the world beyond our sight, but it has its expression in this world in a visible form. Yet the Church, as invisible and as visible, is, by virtue of its one life in Christ, one.

5. This visible Church was instituted by Christ as a fellowship of men united with Him, and in Him with one another, to be His witness and His instrument in the spread of His Kingdom on earth.

6. As a visible Church it must possess certain visible and recognizable marks whereby it can be seen and known by men. These have been since the days of the Apostles at least the following: (a) The profession of faith in God as revealed and incarnate in Christ; (b) the observance of the two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself; (c) an ideal of the Christian life protected by a common discipline; (d) a ministry, representative of the Church, for the preaching of the Word, the administration of the Sacraments, and the maintenance of the unity and continuity of the Church's witness and work. (See II, 1.)

7. Baptism is by the ordinance of Christ and of His Apostles the outward and visible sign of admission into membership of the Church.

8. The Church visible on earth ought to express and manifest to the world by its own visible unity the one Life in Christ of the one Body.

9. The true relation of the Church and local Churches is that which is described in the New Testament—namely, that the Churches are the local representatives of the One Church. The actual situation brought about in the course of history in which there are different and even rival denominational Churches independent of each other and existing together in the same locality, whatever justification arising out of historical circumstances may be claimed for

these temporary separations, cannot be regarded as in accordance with the Purpose of Christ, and every endeavour ought to be made to restore the true position as set forth in the New Testament.

10. The marks which ought to characterize the Church visible on earth are possessed by these existing separate Churches and societies of Christian people in very varying degrees of completeness or defect. Hence, even though they be parts of the visible Church, they cannot be considered as all alike giving equally adequate expression to the Lord's Mind and Purpose. Some, indeed, may be so defective that they cannot rightly be judged to be parts of that Church. But such judgements, though made in trust that they are in accordance with the Divine Mind, must be regarded as limited to the sphere of the visible Church as an ordered society here on earth. It would be presumption to claim that they have a like validity in the sphere of the whole Church as the One Body of the redeemed in Christ, for within that sphere judgement can only be given by the All-knowing Mind and Sovereign Mercy of God.

II. THE MINISTRY

1. A ministry of the Word and Sacrament is a Divine ordinance for the Church, and has been since the days of the Apostles an integral part of its organized life.

2. It is a ministry within the Church exercising representatively, in the Name and by the authority of the Lord Who is the Head of the Church, the powers and functions which are inherent in the Church.

3. It is a ministry of the Church, and not merely of any part thereof.

4. No man can take this ministry upon himself. It must be conferred by the Church, acting through those who have authority given to them in the Church to confer it. There

must be not only an inward call of the Spirit, but also an outward and visible call and commission by the Church.

5. It is in accordance with Apostolic practice and the ancient custom of the Church that this commission should be given through Ordination, with prayer and the laying on of hands by those who have authority given to them to ordain.

6. We believe that in Ordination, together with this commission to minister, Divine Grace is given through the Holy Spirit in response to prayer and faith for the fulfilment of the charge so committed.

7. Within the many Christian Communion into which in the course of history Christendom has been divided, various forms of ministry have grown up according to the circumstances of these several Communion and their beliefs as to the Mind of Christ and the guidance of the New Testament. These various ministries of Word and Sacrament have been, in God's providence, manifestly and abundantly used by the Holy Spirit in His work of 'enlightening the world, converting sinners, and perfecting saints'. But the differences which have arisen with regard to the authority and functions of these various forms of ministry have been and are the occasion of manifold doubts, questions, and misunderstandings. For the allaying of doubts and scruples in the future, and for the more perfect realization of the truth that the ministry is a ministry of the Church, and not merely of any part thereof, means should be provided for the United Church which we desire, whereby its ministry may be acknowledged by every part thereof as possessing the authority of the whole body.

8. In view of the fact that the Episcopate was from early times and for many centuries accepted, and by the greater part of Christendom is still accepted, as the means whereby this authority of the whole body is given, we agree that it ought to be accepted as such for the United Church of the future.

9. Similarly, in view of the place which the Council of Presbyters and the Congregation of the faithful had in the constitution of the early Church, and the preservation of these elements of presbyteral and congregational order in large sections of Christendom, we agree that they should be maintained with a representative and constitutional Episcopate as permanent elements in the order and life of the United Church.

10. The acceptance of Episcopal Ordination for the future would not imply the acceptance of any particular theory as to its origin or character, or the disowning of past ministries of Word and Sacrament otherwise received, which have, together with those received by Episcopal Ordination, been used and blessed by the Spirit of God.

III. THE PLACE OF THE CREED IN A UNITED CHURCH

1. In a united Church there must be unity of Faith, which implies both the subjective element of personal adhesion and an objective standard of truth.

2. The supreme standard of truth is the revelation of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as summed up in Jesus Christ.

3. As the Church in its corporate capacity confesses Christ before men, there should be in the United Church a formal statement of its corporate faith in Christ as an expression of what is intellectually implied by its confession of Him.

4. The Creed commonly called Nicene should be accepted by the United Church as the sufficient statement of this corporate faith. The manner and occasions in which the Creed is to be used should be determined by the United Church.

5. With regard to a confession of faith at Baptism, the United Church would be justified in using the Creed which has been for centuries the Baptismal Creed of the Western Church, commonly called the Apostles' Creed. Its use at

Baptism would imply recognition of the corporate faith of the Church therein expressed as the guide and inspiration of the Christian life.

6. The use of the Creeds liturgically in the public worship of the Church should be regarded as an expression of corporate faith and allegiance; and the United Church should be prepared to recognize diversities of use in this as in other liturgical customs.

7. When assent to the Creeds is required by the United Church, such assent should not be understood to imply the acceptance of them as a complete expression of the Christian Faith, or as excluding reasonable liberty of interpretation. It should be understood to imply the acceptance of them as agreeable to the Word of God contained in the Holy Scriptures, as affirming essential elements in the Christian Faith, and as preserving that Faith in the form in which it has been handed down through many centuries in the history of the Christian Church.

8. While we thus recognize the rightful place of the Creeds in the United Church, we also recognize most fully and thankfully the continued Presence and Teaching of the Living Spirit in His Body, and emphasize the duty of the Church to keep its mind free and ready to receive from Him in each day and generation ever-renewed guidance in the apprehension and expression of the truth.

45. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE ANNUAL ASSEMBLY
SEPTEMBER 1922

I. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England receives the Report concerning Unity, which embodies the provisional statement adopted by the Joint Conference of representatives of the Church of England

and the Evangelical Free Churches meeting at Lambeth, and it records its thanks to its members who have taken part in these deliberations.

II. The Council, in receiving the Report of the Conference would point out that it was not charged by its constituent denominations with the preparation of a scheme of reunion, but simply to inquire into the conditions antecedent thereto; and further, it must be understood that this is an Interim Report, of a preliminary and introductory character. The formal pronouncement on any scheme of union or proposals thereon would at the proper time fall to the authoritative assemblies or courts of the various Churches concerned and would properly arise on an official approach by the Church of England itself. The Council, however, desires to place on record the following findings regarding its main propositions.

- (a) We welcome the statements which declare the essentially spiritual character of the Church of Christ, as having its 'constitutive principle' in 'Christ Himself, living in His members through His Spirit', and as comprehending 'all those who have been or are being redeemed by and in Christ'. We regard this as meaning that no true believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, faith in whom is the one indispensable condition of salvation, are to be held as being outside the Church, whatever institutional rites or forms for the orderly expression of membership it may be right to maintain in the visible Church.
- (b) We appreciate the association for the first time, in a document of the character of the Joint Report, of presbyteral and congregational order along with episcopal. We are of the opinion that the combination of all these elements is the only possible basis of polity for a reunited Church.

(c) We heartily approve of the place assigned to the revelation of God given in the Bible and 'summed up in Jesus Christ' as the 'Supreme Standard of Truth', and also of the 'full and thankful' recognition of 'the continued Presence and Teaching of the Living Spirit' in the Church, which is to receive from Him 'ever renewed guidance in the apprehension and expression of the truth'. We regard the place given to the two ancient catholic creeds as thus subordinate to the inspired Word and living Spirit; and these creeds are received not as a complete expression of the faith, but as preserving 'essential elements' in it 'in the form handed down through many centuries', and with reasonable liberty as to their interpretation and their use. We hold as not only consistent with this, but as implied in it, alike the fullest freedom in the intellectual investigation of Truth and the most single-hearted discipleship to the Mind of Christ.

III. The Council is well aware that there are practical difficulties which yet remain to be considered, and, in particular,

1. What is meant by a 'representative and constitutional' episcopate, and how the elements of presbyteral and congregational order may be combined with it;
2. The Status of the existing Free Church ministry;
3. The relation of the Free Churches to Communion with which they are in fellowship in other parts of the world;
4. The problems connected with the union between Church and State;
5. The safe-guarding of the evangelical principles of the Reformation.

The Federal Council, while earnestly continuing to seek the things of charity and unity, is resolved in no way to imperil either the evangel or the freedom which are the heritage of the Churches it represents.

IV. The Council, while greatly valuing conference with brethren of the Anglican Church over such matters of doctrine and polity as those discussed in this Report, thinks it needful to reaffirm declarations already made more than once on two points, viz. :

- (a) That a primary question in any negotiations concerning unity is whether the Churches engaged in them are prepared to recognize one another as Churches—parts, in their corporate capacity, of the one Church of the Lord Jesus Christ ;
- (b) That discussion of union should be increasingly accompanied by acts of unity between these Churches.

The Council rejoices in the growing spirit of fellowship between the Churches, but is of opinion that in the true interests of unity the time has come when a clear understanding on these points should be sought for by those who represent it in these conferences.

V. The Council reappoints the Committee as follows :

Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., D.D. (Moderator).

Rev. S. M. Berry, M.A.

Rev. Charles Brown, D.D.

Rev. W. T. Davison, M.A., D.D.

Rev. J. C. Carlile, C.B.E., D.D.

Sir Walter Essex.

Rev. W. Y. Fullerton.

Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.

Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A., D.C.L.

Rev. S. Horton.

Rev. H. Maldwyn Hughes, B.A., D.D.

Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D.
Mr. Herbert Marnham.
Bishop H. R. Mumford.
Rev. T. Nightingale.
Prof. A. S. Peake, M.A., D.D.
Rev. Alexander Ramsay, M.A., D.D.
Rt. Hon. Walter Runciman.
Rev. W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D.
Rev. J. Alfred Sharp.
Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson, M.A., D.D.
Rev. Henry Smith.
Rt. Hon. J. H. Whitley, M.P.
Rev. F. L. Wiseman, B.A.
Rev. Thomas Yates.
Rev. Walter H. Armstrong.
Rev. W. L. Robertson, M.A.
Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, M.A., D.D.

And it commends the whole matter, so fraught with great issues for the future of religion in our land and throughout the world, to the interest and prayers of all Christian people.

The following Sub-Committee for Special Conferences at Lambeth was appointed :

Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., D.D.
Rev. Charles Brown, D.D.
Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.
Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D.
Prof. A. S. Peake, M.A., D.D.
Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson, M.A., D.D.
Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, M.A., D.D.

It was agreed to sanction the publication of these Resolutions and their transmission to the Secretaries of the Denominations represented in the Council.

46. *Memorandum on the Status of the Existing
Free Church Ministry*

PRESENTED ON BEHALF OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
REPRESENTATIVES ON THE JOINT CONFERENCE AT
LAMBETH PALACE, JULY 6, 1923

[The Church of England Representatives on the Joint Conference were the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishops of London (Dr. Winnington-Ingram), Winchester (Dr. Talbot), Ely (Dr. Chase), Lichfield (Dr. Kempthorne), Peterborough (Dr. Woods), Chelmsford (Dr. Watts-Ditchfield), Hereford (Dr. Linton-Smith), Ripon (Dr. Strong), Salisbury (Dr. Donaldson), Gloucester (Dr. Headlam), Bishop Gibson, and the Rev. W. H. Frere, D.D.]

The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England at its meeting in September, 1922, received the report of the Joint Conference held at Lambeth Palace, and reappointed its committee and sub-committee to continue the conferences. In so doing, in Paragraph III of its report, the council mentioned certain 'practical difficulties which yet remain to be considered'. Among them was 'the status of the existing Free Church ministry'. Accordingly the sub-committee proceeded to give long and full consideration to this subject, and we who represent the Church of England have been asked to submit a memorandum upon it.

It will be remembered that the main object of the conferences which have been held has been to elucidate the Appeal of the Lambeth Conference to all Christian people. Whatever wishes or opinions we who submit this memorandum may individually have, we consider ourselves bound by that Appeal and not entitled to go beyond its statements, or what in our judgement may be legitimately inferred from them. Further, our memorandum cannot be regarded as an official interpretation of the Appeal. The responsibility for what is contained in it is limited to those who present it.

We are compelled to say at the outset that our difficulty in discussing the status of the Free Church ministry has been to discover accurately what the term includes and implies, whether the phrase represents any accepted unity as to the principles which underlie this ministry, or as to the manner in which it is conferred. We do indeed most thankfully acknowledge that the Free Church members of our committee agreed with us in the statement of principles with regard to the ministry of Christ's Church, which were set forth in our first report (II. 1-6). But the very full, frank, and friendly conferences which we have had together made it plain that in fact within the Free Churches there have been and are very varying traditions and conceptions as to the nature of the ministry, and as to the meaning of Ordination, and very varying customs as to the manner in which Ordination is conferred and ministers are accredited. For example, to mention only one of these differences, although in our first report it was agreed (II. 5) that 'it is in accordance with Apostolic practice and the ancient custom of the Church, that the commission by the Church should be given through Ordination with prayer and laying on of hands by those who have authority given to them to ordain', yet in fact several of the Free Churches have not used in the past and do not always now use the laying on of hands.

During our conferences we have been asked to consider Free Church ministries prospectively—from the point of view of the conceptions and usages in which they are increasingly ready to unite—rather than retrospectively—from the point of view of conceptions and usages which have been prevalent in the past. It is indeed a great satisfaction to think that the principles which we were able to set forth in our first report as agreed upon by us all are becoming more and more fully characteristic of the ministries of the Free Churches represented on our committee.

But our difficulty is that we are specifically asked to write about the Free Church ministry as it exists. We trust that our Free Church brethren in the committee will generously appreciate the difficulty thus frankly expressed, and understand why it is not possible for us to give any single and unconditional answer to the question put before us.

In what follows in this memorandum it will be understood that we have in mind ministries, which in some real measure are given and exercised in accordance with the principles set forth in our first report—ministries which rest upon a long-established order, which have been conferred by some solemn and authoritative act implying Ordination to the ministry of the Universal Church and not merely commission to the ministry of a particular denomination, and which are regarded as involving a life-long vocation.

I

Such Free Church ministries we find it impossible to regard as 'invalid', that is, as null and void, or as effecting none of the purposes for which the ministry has been Divinely ordained in the Church of Christ. Indeed, we wish that the terms 'valid' and 'invalid' could be discontinued, involving as they seem to do a knowledge of the Divine Will and purpose and grace which we do not possess, and which it would be presumption to claim.

But we consider that we are entitled, by manifest tokens of Divine blessing which these ministries possess, and also by the spirit and the terms of the Lambeth Appeal about them, to go further, and to say that we regard them as being within their several spheres real ministries in the Universal Church.

The Bishops, in the Lambeth Appeal, began by saying : ' 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.' And as to the ministries of those communions which do not possess the Episcopate, they say that they do not call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of these ministries, but, on the contrary, they thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace.

It seems to us to be in accordance with the Lambeth Appeal to say, as we are prepared to say, that the ministries which we have in view in this memorandum, ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church.

II

Yet ministries, even when so regarded, may be in varying degrees irregular or defective.

The committee has already agreed in regard to the now separate Churches that, 'even though they be parts of the visible Church, they cannot be considered as all alike giving equally adequate expression to the Lord's mind and purpose.' Such irregularities or defects may belong to the sphere of faith or discipline, and also to the sphere of ministry. There are some who consider our own ministry in one way or another defective or irregular. It is possible that even among the Free Churches themselves there may be ministries exercised by one which are regarded by another as in some respects, more or less important, irregular, or inadequate. In each case such judgements must be regarded as due to our several beliefs as to the mind and purpose of our Lord Himself for His Church and the

continuous guidance of the Holy Spirit within the Church. The existence of these differences with regard to the authority and functions of the ministry, inevitable in the present divided condition of the Church, only increases our longing for a time when, in a united Church, they may be removed.

The belief and practice of the Anglican Church are set forth in the Preface to the Ordinal contained in the Book of Common Prayer, in which it is said ' that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church ; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons ' ; and that ' to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the Church of *England* ; no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of *England*, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination ' .

Thus, the Anglican Church is bound to secure the authorization of its ministers for its own congregations, and no one could be authorized to exercise his ministry among them who had not been episcopally ordained.

It is not possible in this memorandum to set forth fully the reasons for this position. But it can be said :

1. We regard the rule quoted above as much more than a mere rule of internal discipline. It embodies principles to which the Anglican Church has throughout its history adhered, and which contribute to the special position which it claims to hold in the Christian Church.

2. We cannot lose sight of the relations in which we stand to other Episcopal Churches in East and West ; nor can we ignore the danger of creating pain and disturbance, or even the possibility of schism, within our own communion if the rule and principle contained in the Ordinal were to be set aside.

III

In the last section we have stated our position with the frankness which has been characteristic of our conferences. But we hope that what we have there said will be viewed as regards the present, in conjunction with what we have said in the preceding section as to the character of some at least of the Free Church ministries as real ministries of the Word and Sacrament ; and, as regards the future, in conjunction with what was said in the first report of the committee (II. 8, 9). We have there recognized that these ministries have a value of their own as standing for elements of Presbyterian and Congregational order which should be maintained with the Episcopate as permanent elements in the order and life of the United Church. We desire that in the episcopal ordinations of the future these elements should in some real way be represented so that both our traditions and those of the Free Churches should contribute to the fullness of the future ministry of a United Church.

Moreover, we see in the movements towards union, of which our conferences have been a happy and hopeful sign, that a new situation is being created which calls for new ways in which the ministry of the Free Churches and our own may be brought into closer relations. For when circumstances arise which have no exact precedent a true principle of 'economy' entitles the Church to meet them with new methods. We may quote the words of the Committee on Reunion which submitted the Appeal and its accompanying Resolutions to the Lambeth Conference (Report, page 141) :

When men set their faces steadily towards the ideal of our Appeal and especially 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.

Thus (1) As regards the immediate present, here in England, the Convocations of Canterbury and York have endorsed the Resolution of the Lambeth Conference (12. A. [i]). '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.' We earnestly hope that this Resolution will be followed by action in accordance with it. (2) As regards the future, if by God's blessing any of the Free Churches and the Anglican Church were to agree to unite on the basis of the acceptance of Episcopacy for the future, the Lambeth Conference (Resolution 12. A. [iii]) has given its approval to the suggestions that ministers of both the uniting communions should at once be recognized as of equal status in the councils of the United Church, and that the terms of the union should include for the time being the right of non-episcopally ordained ministers to conduct services other than celebrations of the Holy Communion, and to preach in churches which possess an episcopal ministry, if licensed thereto by the Bishop. But the whole subject of the arrangements which should be made for the exercise of ministry by the ministers of one of the uniting Churches in the congregations of the others during the period between the time when the union has been inaugurated and the time when it would be completed by the ministries of all the Churches having one common source and authority, is one which demands further and very careful consideration. We do not think it necessary to discuss this subject in the present memorandum. If our conferences are continued and the subject were to be expressly referred to us, we would be prepared to consider it. It is plain that during this period of transition there would be many inevitable irregularities and difficulties and a constant need of patience,

charity, and mutual considerateness. But there would also be the sustaining and encouraging knowledge that each year would bring the time nearer when union would be sealed by the possession of one ministry throughout the United Church.

IV

Finally, we would urge that it is in the light of this hope for the future rather than from the point of view of the difficulties of the present or of the provisions necessary for a time admittedly transitional that the problem of reunion must be considered. It is towards the fulfilment of this hope that we must direct our thought, our labours, and our prayers.

APPENDED NOTE

PRESENTED ON BEHALF OF THE FREE CHURCH REPRESENTATIVES ON THE JOINT CONFERENCE¹

The representatives of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England on the sub-committee, having considered the document presented by the Anglican members as their reply to the question of the status of the existing Free Church ministries, desire to express their cordial appreciation of the spirit in which the reply is conceived. While recognizing that the responsibility for this answer must rest with the Anglican members, the representatives of the Federal Council desire to record their opinion that the document contains statements of such importance as amply to justify their hope that the Federal Council will reappoint the committee to unite with the representatives of the Church of England in further discussion of the many points that still remain to be considered.

¹ The names of the Free Church representatives are given on page 142, but Sir A. P. Gould and the Rev. A. J. Viner should be omitted, and the Revs. S. M. Berry, J. C. Carlile, F. L. Wiseman, and T. Yates, and Mr. H. Marnham should be added.

47. *The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches*

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE ANNUAL ASSEMBLY
SEPTEMBER 18, 1923

I

The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England receives the report of its committee, which contains the memorandum on 'The Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry' by the Anglican members of the Joint Conference meeting at Lambeth. The Council concurs with its representatives on the Joint Conference in expressing cordial appreciation of the spirit in which this memorandum is conceived, and it has given to it respectful and careful consideration. Believing that a direct communication of this character from the Anglican representatives calls for, and is entitled to, some definite statement as to the attitude of the Free Churches in respect to it, the Council makes the following comments on its main positions :

1. We cordially welcome the crucial declaration that 'the Ministries which we have in view in this memorandum—Ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned—are real Ministries of Christ's Word and Sacrament in the Universal Church'. The Lambeth Appeal itself spoke in general terms of these ministries as having 'spiritual reality' and as having been 'blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace'. It is now explicitly said of them (*a*) that they minister the Gospel of Christ ; (*b*) that they minister also the Sacraments ; and (*c*) that they are within the Universal or Catholic Church. If the recognition thus so unmistakably

given in words were translated into unmistakable actions, a great and difficult problem in reunion would be within sight of practical solution.

2. We note, however, with regret that, in the succeeding section of the memorandum, not only is this recognition not followed by recommendations for appropriate action, but the plan contemplated and required for the exercise of a full ministry within the Anglican Church is precisely that plan which would be followed, and which is followed, in the case of persons possessing no kind of ministry—namely episcopal ordination. This means that what has just been conceded in the most satisfactory language is not to be given effect to in practice. Any question—either on the part of the Anglican Church or of that of the Free Churches—of ‘irregular’ or of what may be regarded as ‘defective’ denominational commission is quite a different matter, to be dealt with in its own proper way; but that way certainly is not ordination to the ministry of Word and Sacrament in the Church of Christ of a man already acknowledged to be in that ministry. All this seems to us manifest and even axiomatic; and we are unable to believe that the position which, at one moment, acknowledges that Free Church ministries are ‘real ministries of Christ’s Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church’, and at the next requires nevertheless that those in them must be ordained to the ministry of that very Word of Christ and those very Sacraments of Christ—that such a position will be found one on which our Anglican brethren with consistency of thinking and acting can permanently stand.

3. We turn to the grounds of this insistence on episcopal ordination and we are referred to the Preface attached to the Ordinal in 1661, which laid it down that ‘no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest or Deacon in the Church of *England*, or suffered to execute

any of the said Functions except he be called, tried, examined and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination'. We remark that this drastic rule, which applies to 'any of the said Functions', is not strictly obeyed by the Church of England to-day as regards the function of preaching; and the Lambeth Conference of 1920—as the present memorandum reminds us—expressly countenances this exception in certain circumstances. This is but one indication that we are dealing to-day not with the Anglicanism of the Restoration, which deliberately desired to exclude Nonconformists and which penalized them, but with the Anglicanism of the Lambeth Appeal, which earnestly seeks reunion and which approaches Nonconformity with friendship. But we should do injustice to our Anglican brethren who present this memorandum if we suggested that they grounded themselves merely on a clause from a preface inserted at a time more marked by controversy than by charity. They say that this preface 'embodies principles to which the Anglican Church has throughout its history adhered'. We submit that this is hardly accurate historically. It is well known that up to the time of this deliberately exclusive preface, there were ministering in the cures of the Church of England 'many'—it is Bishop Cosin's reckoning—who had not received episcopal ordination, and whom the Bishops did not reordain. We do not magnify these cases, which were, we admit, exceptional. But if the Church of England in the seventeenth century could receive ministers from certain reformed Churches without episcopal ordination and yet did not thereby lose its catholic identity, then it could and can—so far as principle goes—in the twentieth century admit, by some method other than ordination, those whom, despite their not having had episcopal hands laid upon them, it has just formally and fully recognized as being really in

the ministry of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church. It could do it so far as any 'principles to which the Anglican Church has throughout its history adhered' are concerned. We ask no immediate or premature answer. We believe that God's guidance of us all in this matter has not ended, and that the last word on it has not been said on either side. We feel deeply that this age-long and difficult problem can be solved only by some great and worthy act, inspired by courage and vision, in which men and Churches are willing to take their lives in their hands for the sake of the realization of a great ideal.

II

The Federal Council makes the above comments on the memorandum which it has received in an entirely conciliatory spirit towards what it recognizes to be a friendly as well as a sincere statement. In the interests of union the representatives of the Free Churches have endeavoured to meet their Anglican brethren at every point so far as they could do so without sacrifice of vital principle. The question of ordination is the place where we look to the Anglican Church to meet their Free Church brethren. The Council has felt that, after three years of fruitful conference, it could express its mind on this subject, as it has done, with perfect frankness. The movement towards re-union has now passed the stage when it can be dealt with simply by discussion. We have come close to the crucial issues, and must deal with them with clearness, courage, and charity.

III

The Council adds that the recognition of Free Church ministries given in the memorandum which it has considered enforces the contention which the Council has more than once emphasized that the deliberations over union in Conferences and committees should be accom-

panied by practical action. Since Anglican clergy and Free Church ministers are in the one Universal Church, and are ministering the same Word and the same Sacraments, then, surely, there should be more of fellowship and co-operation than there is, even though the final difficulty about ordination be not yet surmounted. The Council feels the Union movement cannot—especially in the minds of the people—live entirely on private conferences and their reports; and it renews its declaration of last year that ‘the discussion of union should be increasingly accompanied by acts of unity between the Churches’. It heartily welcomes the references to this towards the close of the memorandum. And in this connexion it notes with warm appreciation the visits of the two Archbishops and some of the Bishops to the Free Church assemblies, and the presence of a number of Free Church preachers in Cathedral and other Anglican pulpits.

IV

The Council recognizes with deep gratitude the guidance and blessing of God in the course which the conferences have taken and the spirit by which they have been moulded. The way of reunion is not yet clear to any one of us. It is our part to seek a fuller understanding of one another in further conference and common prayer, believing that God’s way will be revealed to us.

The Council reappoints the committee as follows :

Rev. Walter H. Armstrong.

Sir Ryland Adkins, K.C.

Rev. J. T. Barkby.

Rev. S. M. Berry, M.A.

Rev. Charles Brown, D.D.

Rev. W. T. Davison, M.A., D.D.

Rev. J. C. Carlile, C.B.E., D.D.

Sir Walter Essex.
Rev. W. Y. Fullerton.
Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.
Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A., D.C.L.
Rev. S. Horton.
Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., D.D.
Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D.
Sir Henry Lunn, M.D.
Mr. Herbert Marnham.
Bishop H. R. Mumford.
Rev. T. Nightingale.
Prof. A. S. Peake, M.A., D.D.
Rev. Alexander Ramsay, M.A., D.D.
Rev. W. L. Robertson, M.A.
Rt. Hon. Walter Runciman.
Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, M.A., D.D.
Rev. W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D.
Rev. J. Alfred Sharp.
Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson, M.A., D.D.
Rev. Henry Smith.
Rt. Hon. J. H. Whitley, M.P.
Rev. F. L. Wiseman, B.A.
Rev. Thomas Yates.

It instructs these representatives to confer further on the matters above mentioned, and also on questions still outstanding of those remitted last year. And it again commends the whole issue to the blessing of God, and to the believing prayers and the practical interest of Christian people.

VII. THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND AND THE UNITED FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

48. *Church of Scotland Act, 1921*

[The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1908 resolved to 'request the other Presbyterian Churches to confer with them on the present ecclesiastical situation . . . with a view to discover in what manner a larger measure of Christian fellowship and co-operation may be secured . . . and the way further prepared for that closer union for which many hearts now eagerly long and pray'. The General Assembly of the United Free Church of Scotland appointed a Committee to consider this invitation; and the next year replied saying that 'while unable to regard co-operation as, in the circumstances, a hopeful way of promoting union they would welcome unrestricted conference on the ecclesiastical situation, and on the main causes which keep the Churches apart; in the earnest hope that, by God's blessing, misunderstandings and hindrances may be removed, and the great object of Presbyterian Re-union in Scotland thereby advanced'. The same year, 1909, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland declared their readiness to enter into such unrestricted conference, and Committees were appointed accordingly by both Assemblies. These Committees reported in 1911 the result of their conferences, under the heads of 'The Spiritual Freedom of the Church' and 'The National Recognition of Religion', stating what were the main causes which kept the Churches apart, arising out of the existing relation of the Church of Scotland to the State. The Church of Scotland intimated its preparedness to seek the removal of these obstacles to union and drafted Articles in 1914 as a Constitution under which the Church would be both National and Free. The outbreak of war in that year arrested further progress; but in 1919 Conferences were resumed, and a joint statement was prepared by the Committees of the Churches fully explaining what would be the practical result of the acceptance of the Articles. (That Joint Report is printed as an Appendix in the Reports of both Committees to their respective Assemblies in 1919.) The Articles were submitted to

the Presbyteries by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and on December 17, 1920 it was reported to the Commission of the General Assembly with 74 out of 84 Presbyteries approving, while 9 disapproved. The Church of Scotland Committee was then authorized to approach the Government, and the Church of Scotland Bill was introduced into Parliament. In May 1921 the Assembly of the Church of Scotland approved the Bill; the Assembly of the United Free Church also welcoming the Articles 'as setting forth a full and adequate statement of the inherent liberties and powers in matters spiritual which the Church has from Christ as its Divine Head as subject to Him alone'. 'The Assembly recognize that in the line therein indicated the continuity and identity of both Churches would be maintained, and that the United Church would bear the character of a purely spiritual institution, in no sense deriving powers from, or controlled by the State, nor possessing privilege to the prejudice of other Churches, the principles of the Churches being safeguarded, while as regards State-relations the main causes keeping them apart have been found capable of being removed.' The Bill thus introduced was passed without any material change and without a Division in either House and received the Royal Assent in July 1921.

Certain questions, however, still remained before the way was clear for an actual incorporating union of the two Churches, notably in relation to the tenure and enjoyment of the property and endowments of the Church of Scotland. Accordingly in 1922 a Departmental Committee was appointed by the Secretary for Scotland 'to enquire and report upon the existing law as affected by the Church of Scotland Act 1921, and as to what further legislative amendments—particularly in relation to the tenure of the property and endowments of the Church of Scotland—are necessary in view of the coming into force of that Act, in order to facilitate Church Union'. This Committee, presided over by Lord Haldane, reported in 1923, and its recommendations were considered by the two General Assemblies in May 1923. Both Assemblies cordially approved the report and its recommendations, and without committing themselves as regards details desired that legislative effect should be given to the recommendations as soon as possible with a view to the undertaking by the Churches of the negotiations necessary to their entering on an incorporating union. The Church of Scotland (Property and Endowments) Bill was introduced in the House of Lords by the Secretary for Scotland on January 15, 1924.]

[11 & 12
GEO. 5.].*Church of Scotland Act, 1921*

[CH. 29]

A. D. 1921. An Act to declare the lawfulness of certain Articles declaratory of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual prepared with the authority of the General Assembly of the Church. [28th July 1921.]

WHEREAS certain articles declaratory of the constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual have been prepared with the authority of the General Assembly of the Church, with a view to facilitate the union of other Churches with the Church of Scotland, which articles are set out in the Schedule to this Act, and together with any modifications of the said articles or additions thereto made in accordance therewith are hereinafter in this Act referred to as 'the Declaratory Articles :

And whereas it is expedient that any doubts as to the lawfulness of the Declaratory Articles should be removed :

Be it therefore enacted by the King's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows :

Effect of
Declaratory
Articles.

1. The Declaratory Articles are lawful articles, and the constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual is as therein set forth, and no limitation of the liberty, rights and powers in matters spiritual therein set forth shall be derived from any statute or law affecting the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual at present in force, it being hereby declared that in all questions of construction the Declaratory Articles shall prevail, and that all such statutes and laws shall be construed in

conformity therewith and in subordination thereto, and all such statutes and laws in so far as they are inconsistent with the Declaratory Articles are hereby repealed and declared to be of no effect. A. D. 1921.

2. Nothing contained in this Act or in any other Act affecting the Church of Scotland shall prejudice the recognition of any other Church in Scotland as a Christian Church protected by law in the exercise of its spiritual functions. Other Churches not to be prejudiced.

3. Subject to the recognition of the matters dealt with in the Declaratory Articles as matters spiritual, nothing in this Act contained shall affect or prejudice the jurisdiction of the civil courts in relation to any matter of a civil nature. Jurisdiction of civil courts.

4. This Act may be cited as the Church of Scotland Act, 1921, and shall come into operation on such date as His Majesty may fix by Order in Council after the Declaratory Articles shall have been adopted by an Act of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland with the consent of a majority of the Presbyteries of the Church. Citations and commencement.

SCHEDULE

ARTICLES DECLARATORY OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND IN MATTERS SPIRITUAL

I. The Church of Scotland is part of the Holy Catholic or Universal Church ; worshipping one God, Almighty, all-wise, and all-loving, in the Trinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the same in substance, equal in power and glory ; adoring the Father, infinite in Majesty, of whom are all things ; confessing our Lord Jesus Christ, the Eternal Son, made very man for our salvation ; glorying in His Cross and Resurrection, and owning obedience to Him as the Head over all things to His Church ; trusting in the promised renewal and guidance of the Holy Spirit ; proclaiming the forgiveness of sins and acceptance with God through faith

A. D. 1921. in Christ, and the gift of Eternal life ; and labouring for the advancement of the Kingdom of God throughout the world. The Church of Scotland adheres to the Scottish Reformation ; receives the Word of God which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as its supreme rule of faith and life ; and avows the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic faith founded thereupon.

II. The principal subordinate standard of the Church of Scotland is the Westminster Confession of Faith approved by the General Assembly of 1647, containing the sum and substance of the Faith of the Reformed Church. Its government is Presbyterian, and is exercised through Kirk-sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods, and General Assemblies. Its system and principles of worship, orders, and discipline are in accordance with ' The Directory for the Public Worship of God ', ' The Form of Presbyterial Church Government ', and ' The Form of Process ', as these have been or may hereafter be interpreted or modified by Acts of the General Assembly or by consuetude.

III. This Church is in historical continuity with the Church of Scotland which was reformed in 1560, whose liberties were ratified in 1592, and for whose security provision was made in the Treaty of Union of 1707. The continuity and identity of the Church of Scotland are not prejudiced by the adoption of these Articles. As a national Church representative of the Christian Faith of the Scottish people it acknowledges its distinctive call and duty to bring the ordinances of religion to the people in every parish of Scotland through a territorial ministry.

IV. This Church, as part of the Universal Church wherein the Lord Jesus Christ has appointed a government in the hands of Church office-bearers, receives from Him, its Divine King and Head, and from Him alone, the right and power subject to no civil authority to legislate, and to adjudicate finally, in all matters of doctrine, worship, government, and discipline in the Church, including the right to determine all questions concerning membership and office in the Church, the constitution and membership of its Courts, and the mode of election of its office-bearers, and to define the

boundaries of the spheres of labour of its ministers and other office-bearers. Recognition by civil authority of the separate and independent government and jurisdiction of this Church in matters spiritual, in whatever manner such recognition be expressed, does not in any way affect the character of this government and jurisdiction as derived from the Divine Head of the Church alone, or give to the civil authority any right of interference with the proceedings or judgements of the Church within the sphere of its spiritual government and jurisdiction. A. D. 1921.

V. This Church has the inherent right, free from interference by civil authority, but under the safeguards for deliberate action and legislation provided by the Church itself, to frame or adopt its subordinate standards, to declare the sense in which it understands its Confession of Faith, to modify the forms of expression therein, or to formulate other doctrinal statements, and to define the relation thereto of its office-bearers and members, but always in agreement with the Word of God and the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith contained in the said Confession, of which agreement the Church shall be sole judge, and with due regard to liberty of opinion in points which do not enter into the substance of the Faith.

VI. This Church acknowledges the divine appointment and authority of the civil magistrate within his own sphere, and maintains its historic testimony to the duty of the nation acting in its corporate capacity to render homage to God, to acknowledge the Lord Jesus Christ to be King over the nations, to obey His laws, to reverence His ordinances, to honour His Church, and to promote in all appropriate ways the Kingdom of God. The Church and the State owe mutual duties to each other, and acting within their respective spheres may signally promote each other's welfare. The Church and the State have the right to determine each for itself all questions concerning the extent and the continuance of their mutual relations in the discharge of these duties and the obligations arising therefrom.

VII. The Church of Scotland, believing it to be the will of Christ that His disciples should be all one in the

A. D. 1921. Father and in Him, that the world may believe that the Father has sent Him, recognizes the obligation to seek and promote union with other Churches in which it finds the Word to be purely preached, the sacraments administered according to Christ's ordinance, and discipline rightly exercised ; and it has the right to unite with any such Church without loss of its identity on terms which this Church finds to be consistent with these Articles.

VIII. The Church has the right to interpret these Articles, and, subject to the safeguards for deliberate action and legislation provided by the Church itself, to modify or add to them ; but always consistently with the provisions of the first Article hereof, adherence to which, as interpreted by the Church, is essential to its continuity and corporate life. Any proposal for a modification of or addition to these Articles which may be approved of by the General Assembly shall, before it can be enacted by the Assembly, be transmitted by way of overture to Presbyteries in at least two immediately successive years. If the overture shall receive the approval, with or without suggested amendment, of two-thirds of the whole of the Presbyteries of the Church, the Assembly may revise the overture in the light of any suggestions by Presbyteries, and may transmit the overture when so revised to Presbyteries for their consent. If the overture as transmitted in its final form shall receive the consent of not less than two-thirds of the whole of the Presbyteries of the Church, the General Assembly may, if it deems it expedient, modify or add to these Articles in terms of the said overture. But if the overture as transmitted in its final form shall not receive the requisite consent, the same or a similar proposal shall not be again transmitted for the consent of Presbyteries until an interval of five years after the failure to obtain the requisite consent has been reported to the General Assembly.

IX. Subject to the provisions of the foregoing Articles and the powers of amendment therein contained, the Constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual is hereby anew ratified and confirmed by the Church.

VIII. THE CHURCH OF SWEDEN

53. *The Reply of the Bishops of the Church of Sweden*

TO THE CONFERENCE OF BISHOPS IN THE ANGLICAN
COMMUNION

April 1922.

[See Resolutions 24 and 25 of the Lambeth Conference, 1920]

With deep and sincere satisfaction we have received the resolution adopted by the Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion, holden at Lambeth in London during the summer 1920, wherein this Conference recommends that members of the Swedish Church, qualified to receive the Sacrament in their own Church, should be admitted to Holy Communion in the Anglican Church, as well as that on suitable occasions permission should be given to Swedish ecclesiastics to give addresses in churches belonging to the Anglican Communion. That the Lambeth Conference, after long and thoroughgoing negotiations which have taken place in this matter during recent years, now for its own part has found the time come for a closer connexion between the two Churches, of such a kind as from its most important feature might be characterized as intercommunion, this is to us a source of real joy, because we see therein a step towards that great goal for which we pray and strive with you : that the unity which has always existed and exists between all true disciples of Christ, should be better realized than hitherto also in external matters, and also because of the direct and practical importance, which such a connexion must have for the work

to which our Church is called, for the pastoral task which is imposed upon her by the Lord of the Church even for those of its members who live outside the borders of their own country, and thus also and particularly for those who live within the British Empire.

The question of the terms of communion between two Churches has not been the object of general discussions and resolutions among us to the same extent as among you, for reasons which will appear from the following pages. But from the practice which has been followed hitherto in this matter by our Church, these two principles might be drawn : (1) To individual members of foreign communions who have desired more occasionally to take part in Holy Communion in our Church for the strengthening of their inner life, this right has been conceded as a duty of charity. A refusal of this right in such cases, *in casu necessitatis*, will hardly have occurred in our Church. (2) A concession of this right *in genere* to the members of a certain communion, on the other hand, presupposes that an essential agreement, proved by the confessional documents of the communion in question, exists as regards the spirit and the main points of Christian faith. In the case of those communions which, like our own, have accepted the *Confessio Augustana*, the concession of such general intercommunion has been considered as quite natural, while in other cases the matter has been thought to demand a particular inquiry. But that the direct acceptance of the *Confessio Augustana* has not been considered in all cases as the necessary condition for the concession of intercommunion is shown also by the fact, which has a particular interest in this case, that already once before, from the seventeenth century, intercommunion of this kind has existed in North America between our Church and yours. Two centuries later, during some years after 1866, Swedish emigrants to the United States were recommended to the Protestant Episcopal Church in such

places where there was no access to a Swedish Evangelic Lutheran community.¹

Thus, in the question of intercommunion our Church has not attached decisive weight either to the doctrine of the ministry in general or to what is usually called the Apostolical Succession of Bishops and the questions thereby implied. The deeper reason for this is derived from our fundamental conceptions, and has been explained several times during the preparatory investigations, and particularly during the negotiations in Upsala in September 1909, by the representatives of the Swedish Church. For the explanation of this position, which we think that we ought also now to emphasize, we refer to the points with regard to the doctrine of the Swedish Church on the ministry that were on that occasion laid before the Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1909, and form part of the report issued in 1911 by this Committee.² From these points we quote :

‘ 3. No particular organization of the Church and of its ministry is instituted *iure divino*, not even the order and discipline and state of things recorded in the New Testament, because the Holy Scriptures, the *norma normans* of the faith of the Church, are no law, but vindicate for the

¹ In the circular letter of the Clerus Comitialis to the clergy from the Diet of 1865-6, it was recommended that a testimonial to this effect should be given to emigrants. Amongst the reasons for this it is said ‘ that a Bishop of the English Episcopal Church in the United States, now present in our capital, has given us the kindest assurances that such of our countrymen as go to places where there are no Evangelical Lutheran Communities, may be sure to find necessary assistance in matters spiritual as well as temporal at the hands of the clergy of the English Church, if they choose to apply to them, without the slightest attempt being made by the English Church to imbue them with other doctrines than those which our Church confesses, or to separate them in any respect from this Church ’.

² See *The Church of England and the Church of Sweden* (Mowbray), 1911, p. 18. [Editor.]

New Covenant the great principle of Christian freedom, unweariedly asserted by St. Paul against every form of legal religion, and applied with fresh strength and clearness by Luther, but instituted by our Saviour Himself, as, for instance, when, in taking farewell of His disciples, He did not regulate their future work by *a priori* rules and institutions, but directed them to the guidance of the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost.

' 4. The object of any organization and of the whole ministry being included in the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments—according to the fifth article of the *Augustana*, God has instituted *ministerium docendi evangelii et porrigendi sacramenta*—our Church cannot recognize any essential difference, *de iure divino*, of aim and authority between the two or three Orders into which the ministry of grace may have been divided, *iure humano*, for the benefit and convenience of the Church.

' 5. The value of every organization of the *ministerium ecclesiasticum*, and of the Church in general, is only to be judged by its fitness and ability to become a pure vessel for the supernatural contents, and a perfect channel for the way of Divine Revelation unto mankind.

' 6. That doctrine in no wise makes our Church indifferent to the organization and the forms of ministry which the cravings and experiences of the Christian community have produced under the guidance of the Spirit in the course of history. We do not only regard the peculiar forms and traditions of our Church with the reverence due to a venerable legacy from the past, but we realize in them a blessing from the God of history accorded to us.'

From the conception of our Church regarding the ministry which has been declared here again, it follows that for us decisive importance must be attached, not to any questions of a more formal character, but to the question whether and how far the two communities agree in these

ideas as to the content of that message of salvation, founded on the divine revelation, which has been committed to both of them. The differences which no doubt can be found here must be neither overrated nor underrated. The difference as to the emphasis laid on the doctrine of the ministry, which has appeared above, might point to a certain discrepancy even in matters that have a more central position according to our valuation. Another point which presents itself to the mind when the question of intercommunion is raised, is the difference which, according to the confessions of both Churches, exists in their conception of the Lord's Supper itself. The judgement of the extent of this difference is made more difficult by the fact, which has appeared also during the preparatory negotiations, that evidently within the Anglican Church itself different doctrines are held on these two questions.

Yet, and without any wish to belittle the difference that exists between the two Churches, we do not hesitate to pronounce as our opinion that during the course of the preparatory negotiations, and so far as we have gradually got to know more about the Anglican Church, our impression of that unity which binds the two Churches together in what is deepest and most central, has become predominant. In the Church and the congregation of Christ, as in every living body, real concord is not characterized by uniformity, but by unity in diversity. A detailed definition of those matters in which this concord appears cannot be attempted here. But yet we do not feel justified in pretermittting briefly to call attention to two points, which are to us more decisive than all others, with regard to the purity of the Christian doctrine—viz., the recognition of Scripture as *norma normans* both with regard to life and doctrine, and the building of our salvation on God's grace alone received by faith.

The first of those principles means to us that in matters

of faith no other authority must be put directly or indirectly above or, which is the same thing, on a level with the prophetic and apostolic word in Holy Scripture, as the message preserved to us of the works of God for the salvation of man in that history of salvation, wherein the all-commanding centre which everything else presages or points back to is Jesus Christ. The prophetic and apostolic message has sprung out of the revelation of God Himself and is itself a part of this revelation. All later expressions of Christian faith, however great their value may be, are to be considered only as more or less reliable guides to or, in the words of the *Formula Concordiae*, 'witnesses' of this revelation, witnesses whose verdicts must always be tested, by the experience of the Church and of the individual Christian, in the light of the revelation itself, which is recorded, confessed, and interpreted in the prophetic and apostolic message, and is only thus accessible to us.

When we put beside the principle of revelation the principle of faith or grace, this is at bottom not another principle by the side of the first, but we mean only thereby to make the content of revelation more clear from a certain point of view. The revelation is throughout essentially a revelation of God's prevenient and unconditional grace, precedent to and independent of all human endeavour—that is, a revelation of the love of God, which, while condemning sin, searches for the sinner and restores him with His forgiveness. What we want to express by this is not only one, not even the most central, of those Christian doctrines which have grown out of the divine revelation, but the fundamental direction and meaning of God's whole activity for salvation, whereby He has revealed Himself to us, and has, in spite of our sin, opened to us in Jesus Christ His paternal bosom. The revelation has no other meaning that could be put on a level with this: everything else that we derive from it is only a consequence of this. And when we

combine the grace of God and the faith of man in a close connexion, we mean only to determine thereby more fully the nature of prevenient grace against all pelagianizing tendencies. Faith means to us not something which man has to do that might precede and be a condition of God's grace and remission of sins, but faith is only that *ὄργανον ληπτικόν* which is created by God's grace, and whereby God's grace is received by man : out of the revelation of God's love in Christ Jesus our trust in this love is born, and by that it is sustained. The new moral life is a fruit of this communion with God, which has been opened to us independently of any works of man. Our moral life is not the condition of, and does not sustain, our religious relationship to God, but it is rather conditioned and sustained thereby. ' Good works ' are, to speak with Luther, not the condition of blessedness, but that blessedness, which is prepared for us in spite of our sin, when we are called to be the children of God, is the condition without which ' good works ' cannot be done at all. That those two principles, which we began this letter by discerning, are fundamentally one is made still more manifest by contemplating the opposites, which are denied by them. If the principle of revelation turns in the first place against any form of institutionalism and legalism (nomism), the principle of faith or of grace has primarily in view all sorts of pelagianism. But then institutionalism, nomism, and pelagianism are only different aspects of that one fundamental conception which is totally denied by us. Both principles could be most simply combined in this : Between God and the soul, or which is the same to us, between Christ and the faith, nothing, no third principle, no institution, no law, no proper works, must intervene.

The same conception is contained in its outlines, so far as we have been able to see, partly in the sixth, partly in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth of the Thirty-nine Articles.

We are convinced that between our branches of the Universal Church of Christ, notwithstanding the shades of opinion that may exist, there is an essential unity in that fundamental conception which we have now briefly indicated, and to which we unswervingly adhere. In this conviction we accept with fraternal confidence the outstretched hand. We rejoice at the decision of the Anglican Bishops, and on our side we approve of the practice that members of the Anglican Communion, qualified to receive the Sacrament in their own Church, should be admitted to Holy Communion in our Church, as well as that on suitable occasions permission should be given to Anglican ecclesiastics to give addresses in our churches and there to perform religious functions.

To this general answer we ought to add a few words about some special questions, mentioned in the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference and in the report of a Special Committee, by which the resolutions were prepared :

1. With regard to Resolution 25 of the Conference, where it is recommended that in the event of an invitation being extended to an Anglican Bishop or Bishops to take part in the consecration of a Swedish Bishop, the invitation should, if possible, be accepted, subject to approval of the Metropolitan, we express our satisfaction that a wish, expressed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in a letter of August 11, 1920, to the Archbishop of Upsala, when communicating to him the Lambeth resolutions—viz., that for the future a reciprocal assistance of Bishops from one of the Churches at the consecration of Bishops in the other might be practised when a suitable occasion presents itself—has now already begun to be put into practice by the assistance of two Anglican Bishops at the consecration of two Swedish Bishops in Upsala on September 19, 1920.¹ We recommend,

¹ The Bishops of Durham and Peterborough took part in the consecration of the Bishops of Västerås and Visby. [*Editor.*]

further, that in case such an invitation to take part in the consecration of an Anglican Bishop should be extended to a Swedish Bishop, it should, if possible, be accepted, subject to the approval of the Archbishop.

2. The Committee appointed by the Lambeth Conference to report on these questions gives expression in its report to two desiderata which were discussed already in the preliminary negotiations in Upsala in September 1909. They concern, firstly, the establishment in the Church of Sweden of a Diaconate of the same kind as that existing in the Anglican Communion; and, secondly, the introduction, likewise in accordance with the Anglican practice, of the laying-on of hands as an outward sign of grace given in Confirmation.

With regard to these two desiderata, which, as we notice, have neither now nor formerly been made in any way conditional for intercommunion, we wish to make the following brief statements:

(a) In our Church we do not now possess any Order exactly corresponding to the Anglican Diaconate. For a number of years, however, we have had among us a male Diaconate for the service of charity among the sick, the infirm, the poor, the lost, thus of the same character as the Diaconate of women, which is older and more amply developed among us. In Resolution 49 of the Lambeth Conference, this Diaconate is said to be the primitive one in the Christian Church, a statement which is undoubtedly true according to Acts vi. No need of or wish for a Diaconate as an introduction to the ministry has been expressed in our Church.

(b) The question about laying-on of hands in Confirmation has, in our opinion, decidedly the character of an adiaphoron. Consequently, we have no scruples against the use of this beautiful rite, which is practised in our Church on other occasions; on the other hand, we cannot accept it if

supported by arguments that would in any way question its character of an adiaphoron.

In this connexion we do not feel justified in pretermitting to draw your attention to the very great importance that our Church attaches to the thorough instruction of the first communicants in the fundamentals of the Christian faith, as being an indispensable condition for Confirmation—a requirement that does not seem to be paid the same attention in the Anglican practice of Confirmation. Against the admission to the Lord's Supper in our Church of persons confirmed in the Anglican Church, hesitation has earlier been expressed among us because of the duty of instruction laid on the Church in Matt. xxviii. 20. Nevertheless, this has not prevented admission to Holy Communion in our Church for those confirmed in the Anglican Church. We are of opinion that both Churches may have something to learn from each other, both with regard to the preparation for Confirmation and to the act itself and its significance. Thus, what has been said about the instruction of the first communicants must be considered as a desideratum, but not as a condition for intercommunion.

3. Lastly, in order to prevent any misunderstanding, we have to draw your attention to the fact that the Augustana Synod in North America and the Tamil Eyangelical Lutheran Church in South India, which may be considered as daughter communities of the Church of Sweden, and with which our Church has intercommunion and a very intimate fellowship also in other respects, are nevertheless quite independent Churches, so that no conclusions with regard to them can be drawn from agreements made by the Church of Sweden for the promotion of unity in the Church of Christ.

May God give His blessing to the more intimate connexion between our Churches that we are now establishing, and may the Church of Christ in our countries from this connexion reap rich fruits for her spiritual life.

May we thus also be made better fitted to become instruments in the hand of God for the establishing of the bond of unity and peace between the disciples of Christ all over the earth !

STOCKHOLM,

April 21, 1922.

Signed on behalf of the Conference of Bishops of the Church of Sweden, holden at Sankta Clara, Stockholm, April 20 to 21, 1922.

NATHAN SÖDERBLOM

Archbishop of Upsala.

GOTTFRID BILLING

Bishop of Lund.

HJI DANELL

Bishop of Skara.

Swedish Bishops Conference Delegation.

XI. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

58. *The Protestant Episcopal Church*

CANON 36: OF THE ORDINATION OF DEACONS AND PRIESTS IN SPECIAL CASES

(Adopted by the General Convention, September 1922)

[Certain Proposals for an Approach towards Unity, generally known as the Concordat, were issued in March 1919, by ten members of the Protestant Episcopal Church and eleven members of Congregational Churches in the United States of America, including in a schedule the form of a proposed Canon. These Proposals were submitted to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in September 1919, and referred to a Joint Commission with certain instructions. That Joint Commission reported to the General Convention in September 1922, and after considerable debate a new Canon was adopted (revised 1934 as below).]

1. In case any Minister who has not received episcopal ordination shall desire to receive such orders from a Bishop of this Church to the Diaconate and to the Priesthood without giving up or denying his fellowship or his ministry in the Communion to which he belongs, the Bishop of the Diocese or Missionary District in which he lives, with the advice and consent of the Standing Committee or the Council of Advice, may confirm and ordain him; *provided*, also, that the congregation, if any, in which such Minister officiates, shall declare, through its proper representatives, its desire for such ordination on behalf of its Minister, and its purpose to receive in future the ministrations and the Sacraments of one who shall have been ordained to the Priesthood by a Bishop.

2. The Minister desiring to be so ordained shall satisfy the Bishop that he has resided in the United States at least one year; that he has been duly baptized with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; that he holds the historic faith of the Church as contained

in the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed ; that there is no sufficient objection on grounds physical, mental, moral or spiritual ; that the Ecclesiastical Authority to which he is subject in the Communion to which he belongs consents to such ordination ; that he shall not knowingly admit to the Holy Communion any person who has not been baptized with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost ; and further, the Bishop shall charge him that this Church hopefully anticipates the use of the Apostolic practice of Confirmation among his people.

3. At the time of such ordination the person so to be ordained shall subscribe and make in the presence of the Bishop a declaration that he believes the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God and to contain all things necessary to salvation ; that in the ministration of Baptism he will unfailingly baptize with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. He shall also undertake that in the celebration of the Holy Communion he will invariably use the elements of bread and wine, and will include in the service (*a*) a Prayer of Consecration, embodying the words and acts of our Lord in the Institution of the Sacrament, an Offering, an Invocation of the Holy Spirit, and a Thanksgiving, (*b*) the Lord's Prayer, and (*c*) the Apostles' Creed or the Nicene Creed as the symbol of the faith and unity of the Holy Catholic Church. He shall also agree that when thereto invited by the Bishop of this Church having jurisdiction in the place where he lives, he will (unless unavoidably prevented) meet with such Bishop for Holy Communion and for counsel and co-operation ; and that he will hold himself answerable to the Bishop of this Church having jurisdiction in the place where he lives, or, if there be no such Bishop, to the Presiding Bishop of this Church, in case he be called in question with respect to error of faith or of conduct.

4. In case a person so ordained be charged with error of faith or of conduct he shall have reasonable notice of the charge and reasonable opportunity to be heard, and the procedure shall be similar to the procedure in the case of a clergyman of this Church charged with the like offence. The sentence shall always be pronounced by the Bishop and shall be such as a Clergyman of this Church would be liable to. It shall be certified to the Ecclesiastical Authority to which the defendant is responsible in any other Communion. If he shall have been tried before a tribunal of the Communion in which he has exercised his ministry, the judgment of such tribunal proceeding in the due exercise of its jurisdiction shall be taken as conclusive evidence of facts thereby adjudged.

5. A Minister so ordained may officiate according to the prescribed order of this Church in a Diocese or Missionary District of this Church when licensed by the Ecclesiastical Authority thereof, but he shall not become the Rector or a Minister of any Parish or Congregation of this Church until he shall have subscribed and made to the Ordinary a declaration in writing, whereby he shall solemnly engage to conform to the Doctrine, Discipline and Worship of this Church. Upon his making such declaration and being duly elected Rector or Minister of a Parish or Congregation of this Church, and complying with the Canons of this Church and of the Diocese or Missionary District in that behalf, he shall become for all purposes a Minister of this Church.

6 (a). If any Minister who has not received Episcopal ordination desires to be made a Deacon or to be ordered Priest in this Church, without giving up or denying his fellowship or his ministry in the Communion to which he belongs, after the Bishop of the Diocese is satisfied that he has resided in the United States at least one year; that he has been duly baptized with water in the name of the

Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; that he holds the historic faith of the Church as contained in the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed; that there is no sufficient objection on grounds physical, mental, moral or spiritual; the Bishop with the consent of the Standing Committee or of the Council of Advice of the Missionary District obtained after the canonical requirements precedent to ordination as set forth in this Canon have been fulfilled may make him a Deacon or order him Priest. At the time of such ordination the Bishop may read this preface to the service:

A. B., who has already been ordained a minister of Christ, and desires to be a Deacon (*or* Priest) in this Church, has satisfied the Ecclesiastical Authority of this Diocese that he accepts the Doctrine, Discipline and Worship of this Church. We are about to confer upon him authority to minister in this Church.

(b) The letters of ordination in such cases may contain the words: Recognizing the ministry which he has already received and hereby adding to that commission the grace and authority of Holy Orders as required for the exercise of the ministry of this Church.

(c) If any minister who has been ordained to the Diaconate or to the Priesthood by a Bishop whose authority to convey such orders is open to question, shall desire to exercise his ministry in this Church, the Bishop of the Diocese in which he resides shall, if necessary, baptize him and confirm him, and with the advice and consent of the Standing Committee or of the Council of Advice of the Missionary District after all canonical requirements precedent to ordination have been fulfilled, may ordain him conditionally to the Diaconate and to the Priesthood. The Bishop at the time of such ordination shall read this preface to the service:

A. B., who was ordained by a Bishop whose authority is not recognized by this Church, has now satisfied the Bishop of the Diocese that he accepts the Doctrine, Discipline and

Worship of this Church, and desires conditional ordination. We propose to give assurance that A. B. is qualified to minister in this Church.¹

7. In this Canon the action to be taken by a Bishop is limited to that of the Bishop of a Diocese or Missionary District, having jurisdiction therein.

60. *The Protestant Episcopal Church and the Czecho-Slovak Orthodox Church in America*

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH²

DECEMBER 13, 1922

[According to the Report of the Anglican and Foreign Church Society published in 1920 (S.P.C.K.), a number of Czech priests of the Roman Catholic Church, whose demands for certain drastic ecclesiastical reforms had been rejected by the Pope, held a meeting at Prague on January 8, 1920 and decided to establish an independent Czech Church. The Reformed Czecho-Slovak Church was accordingly officially recognized by the Czecho-Slovak State on February 29, 1920. Later (see *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1922) negotiations were opened with the Serbian Orthodox Church, with the result that union with that Church was proclaimed in the autumn of 1921. Dr. Pavlik, one of three priests elected by the votes of the parishes to be Bishops in the new Church, was consecrated on September 20, 1921, at Belgrade by the Patriarch of Jugoslavia, assisted by other Serbian Bishops and the Russian Archbishop Antony of Kiev, as the first Bishop of the Czecho-Slovak Church. As a condition of union with the Serbian Church, the Czecho-Slovak Church formally accepted the dogmas of the Eastern Orthodox Church, and the first seven Oecumenical Councils.]

The National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America has received with pleasure

¹ Section 6 of this Canon (formerly Canon 11, now renumbered 36) was added at the revision of 1934, the former section 6 becoming section 7.

² For a statement of recent communications on the part of the American Episcopal Church with the several European Churches

the Memorandum presented by the Right Reverend Gorazd Pavlik, Bishop of the Czecho-Slovak Church, dated December 11, 1922, which Memorandum was read to the Council at the opening of its regular meeting held December 13, 1922, by the President.

The Council has watched with interest the re-establishment of the ancient National Church in Czecho-Slovakia, and notes with gratification the statement in the Memorandum that the Dogmatic Standards of the newly-organized Church, as set forth in the decrees of the Ecclesiastical Mass Meetings held in Prague in the year 1921, have the same foundation as our own, and that the new Bishop was regularly consecrated by the Serbian Orthodox Church, whose Orders we recognize as Apostolic.

Our Church has long been concerned for the spiritual welfare of the Czecho-Slovak people in America, such large numbers of whom have been living and bringing up their children without any religious ministrations. It is with a deep sense of responsibility that we receive this expression of Bishop Gorazd Pavlik of his desire for our Church's cooperation in reaching his unchurched people in America, and we earnestly express our desire to do everything in our power to co-operate in this all-important matter.

Concerning the first of the specific requests of the Czecho-Slovak Bishop, namely, for the mutual fellowship of our respective Churches, we will communicate with our Bishops in the various Dioceses in which communicants of the Czecho-Slovak Orthodox Church live, and urge them to provide the Sacraments and Pastoral Care for them in such places where it may be either difficult or impossible to secure a priest of the Czecho-Slovak Orthodox Church. And also we will advise the Bishops in the various Dioceses

and the Churches of the Near East, see *Report to the National Council on Visit to the Churches of Europe and the Near East* by Rev. W. C. Emhardt (*The Christian East*, August and November 1923).

to give fraternal co-operation and moral support to the parishes of the Czecho-Slovak Orthodox Church which may be established in America. Moreover, we express our desire that the Czecho-Slovak Orthodox Church minister in like manner to communicants of our Church visiting or residing in the Republic of Czecho-Slovakia.

In response to the second¹ specific request of the Czecho-Slovak Bishop, the Council has directed its Department of Missions to keep in vital and intimate touch with the situation, needs and developments of the Czecho-Slovak Orthodox Church, both in Europe and America.

¹ This second request was ' that the Presiding Bishop and Council bring about the creation of a Commission whose function would be to keep in vital intimate touch with the situation, needs, and development of the Czecho-Slovak Orthodox Church both in Europe and America '.

XIII. CANADA

65. *The United Church of Canada*

THE BASIS OF UNION AS PREPARED BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE PRESBYTERIAN, METHODIST, AND CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES IN CANADA, AND APPROVED BY THE SUPREME COURTS OF THESE CHURCHES, JANUARY 1924

[The Basis of Union, as agreed upon by the Joint Committee on Church Union representing the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches in Canada, has been finally accepted by the representative assemblies of those Churches themselves, after conferences and negotiations lasting over twenty years. Resolutions to adopt the Basis and to take the necessary legal steps to consummate the Union were carried (1) by the General Conference of the Methodist Church of Canada in October 1922 (unanimously), (2) by the Annual Gathering of the Congregational Union of Canada in June 1923 (by 54 votes to 3), and (3) by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada in June 1923 (by 427 votes to 129). Further, the General Council of Local Union Churches (a movement mainly belonging to Western Canada) has given its assurance that 'the Local Union Churches are ready to merge into the United Church of Canada as soon as the contemplated Union is effected'.

As is explained in the 'Appendix on Law', 'in order to give legal consummation to the Union it is necessary that the United Church should be incorporated by a special Act of the Parliament of Canada, while special Acts of the legislatures of the several Provinces of the Dominion and Newfoundland and the Bermudas and any other country in which the negotiating Churches hold property should also be obtained'.]

GENERAL

1. The name of the Church formed by the union of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches in Canada, shall be 'The United Church of Canada'.

2. It shall be the policy of The United Church to foster the spirit of unity in the hope that this sentiment of unity may in due time, so far as Canada is concerned, take shape in a Church which may fittingly be described as national.

DOCTRINE

We, the representatives of the Presbyterian, the Methodist, and the Congregational branches of the Church of Christ in Canada, do hereby set forth the substance of the Christian faith, as commonly held among us. In doing so, we build upon the foundation laid by the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone. We affirm our belief in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the primary source and ultimate standard of Christian faith and life. We acknowledge the teaching of the great creeds of the ancient Church. We further maintain our allegiance to the evangelical doctrines of the Reformation, as set forth in common in the doctrinal standards adopted by the Presbyterian Church in Canada, by the Congregational Union of Ontario and Quebec, and by the Methodist Church. We present the accompanying statement as a brief summary of our common faith and commend it to the studious attention of the members and adherents of the negotiating Churches, as in substance agreeable to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures.

ARTICLE I. *Of God.* We believe in the one only living and true God, a Spirit, infinite, eternal and unchangeable, in His being and perfections; the Lord Almighty, who is love, most just in all His ways, most glorious in holiness, unsearchable in wisdom, plenteous in mercy, full of compassion, and abundant in goodness and truth. We worship Him in the unity of the Godhead and the mystery of the Holy Trinity, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, three persons of the same substance, equal in power and glory.

ARTICLE II. *Of Revelation.* We believe that God has revealed Himself in nature; in history, and in the heart of man; that He has been graciously pleased to make clearer revelation of Himself to men of God who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit; and that in the fullness of time

He has perfectly revealed Himself in Jesus Christ, the Word made flesh, who is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person. We receive the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, given by inspiration of God, as containing the only infallible rule of faith and life, a faithful record of God's gracious revelations, and as the sure witness to Christ.

ARTICLE III. *Of the Divine Purpose.* We believe that the eternal, wise, holy and loving purpose of God so embraces all events that while the freedom of man is not taken away, nor is God the author of sin, yet in His providence He makes all things work together in the fulfilment of His sovereign design and the manifestation of His glory.

ARTICLE IV. *Of Creation and Providence.* We believe that God is the creator, upholder and governor of all things ; that He is above all His works and in them all ; and that He made man in His own image, meet for fellowship with Him, free and able to choose between good and evil, and responsible to his Maker and Lord.

ARTICLE V.—*Of the Sin of Man.* We believe that our first parents, being tempted, chose evil, and so fell away from God and came under the power of sin, the penalty of which is eternal death ; and that, by reason of this disobedience, all men are born with a sinful nature, that we have broken God's law and that no man can be saved but by His grace.

ARTICLE VI.—*Of the Grace of God.* We believe that God, out of His great love for the world, has given His only-begotten Son to be the Saviour of sinners, and in the Gospel freely offers His all-sufficient salvation to all men. We believe also that God, in His own good pleasure, gave to His Son a people, an innumerable multitude, chosen in Christ unto holiness, service and salvation.

ARTICLE VII.—*Of the Lord Jesus Christ.* We believe in and confess the Lord Jesus Christ, the only Mediator between

God and man, who, being the Eternal Son of God, for us men and for our salvation became truly man, being conceived of the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary, yet without sin. Unto us He has revealed the Father, by His word and Spirit, making known the perfect will of God. For our redemption He fulfilled all righteousness, offered Himself a perfect sacrifice on the cross, satisfied Divine Justice and made propitiation for the sins of the whole world. He rose from the dead and ascended into Heaven, where He ever intercedes for us. In the hearts of believers He abides for ever as the indwelling Christ; above us and over us all He rules; wherefore, unto Him we render love, obedience and adoration as our Prophet, Priest and King.

ARTICLE VIII.—*Of the Holy Spirit.* We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, who moves upon the hearts of men to restrain them from evil and to incite them unto good, and whom the Father is ever willing to give unto all who ask Him. We believe that He has spoken by holy men of God in making known His truth to men for their salvation; that, through our exalted Saviour, He was sent forth in power to convict the world of sin, to enlighten men's minds in the knowledge of Christ, and to persuade and enable them to obey the call of the Gospel; and that He abides with the Church, dwelling in every believer as the Spirit of truth, of power, of holiness, of comfort and of love.

ARTICLE IX.—*Of Regeneration.* We believe in the necessity of regeneration, whereby we are made new creatures in Christ Jesus by the Spirit of God, who imparts spiritual life by the gracious and mysterious operation of His power, using as the ordinary means the truths of His word and the ordinances of divine appointment in ways agreeable to the nature of man.

ARTICLE X.—*Of Faith and Repentance.* We believe that faith in Christ is a saving grace whereby we receive Him,

trust in Him, and rest upon Him alone for salvation as He is offered to us in the Gospel, and that this saving faith is always accompanied by repentance, wherein we confess and forsake our sins with full purpose of and endeavour after a new obedience to God.

ARTICLE XI.—*Of Justification and Sonship.* We believe that God, on the sole ground of the perfect obedience and sacrifice of Christ, pardons those who by faith receive Him as their Saviour and Lord, accepts them as righteous and bestows upon them the adoption of sons, with a right to all the privileges therein implied, including a conscious assurance of their sonship.

ARTICLE XII.—*Of Sanctification.* We believe that those who are regenerated and justified grow in the likeness of Christ through fellowship with Him, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and obedience to the truth; that a holy life is the fruit and evidence of saving faith; and that the believer's hope of continuance in such a life is in the preserving grace of God. And we believe that in this growth in grace Christians may attain that maturity and full assurance of faith whereby the love of God is made perfect in us.

ARTICLE XIII.—*Of Prayer.* We believe that we are encouraged to draw near to God, our Heavenly Father, in the name of His Son, Jesus Christ, and on our own behalf and that of others to pour out our hearts humbly yet freely before Him, as becomes His beloved children, giving Him the honour and praise due His holy name, asking Him to glorify Himself on earth as in heaven, confessing unto Him our sins and seeking of Him every gift needful for this life and for our everlasting salvation. We believe also that, inasmuch as all true prayer is prompted by His Spirit, He will in response thereto grant us every blessing according to His unsearchable wisdom and the riches of His grace in Jesus Christ.

ARTICLE XIV.—*Of the Law of God.* We believe that the

moral law of God, summarized in the Ten Commandments, testified to by the prophets and unfolded in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ, stands for ever in truth and equity, and is not made void by faith, but on the contrary is established thereby. We believe that God requires of every man to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God; and that only through this harmony with the will of God shall be fulfilled that brotherhood of man wherein the kingdom of God is to be made manifest.

ARTICLE XV.—*Of the Church.* We acknowledge one holy Catholic Church, the innumerable company of saints of every age and nation, who being united by the Holy Spirit to Christ their Head are one body in Him and have communion with their Lord and with one another. Further, we receive it as the will of Christ that His Church on earth should exist as a visible and sacred brotherhood, consisting of those who profess faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him, together with their children, and other baptized children, and organized for the confession of His name, for the public worship of God, for the administration of the sacraments, for the upbuilding of the saints, and for the universal propagation of the Gospel; and we acknowledge as a part, more or less pure, of this universal brotherhood, every particular Church throughout the world which professes this faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him as divine Lord and Saviour.

ARTICLE XVI.—*Of the Sacraments.* We acknowledge two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which were instituted by Christ, to be of perpetual obligation as signs and seals of the covenant ratified in His precious blood, as means of grace, by which, working in us, He doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and comfort our faith in Him, and as ordinances through the observance of which His Church is to confess her Lord and be visibly distinguished from the rest of the world.

1. Baptism with water into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit is the sacrament by which are signified and sealed our union to Christ and participation in the blessings of the new covenant. The proper subjects of baptism are believers, and infants presented by their parents or guardians in the Christian faith. In the latter case the parents or guardians should train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and should expect that their children will, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, receive the benefits which the sacrament is designed and fitted to convey. The Church is under the most solemn obligation to provide for their Christian instruction.

2. The Lord's Supper is the sacrament of communion with Christ and with His people, in which bread and wine are given and received in thankful remembrance of Him and His sacrifice on the cross ; and they who in faith receive the same do, after a spiritual manner, partake of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ to their comfort, nourishment and growth in grace. All may be admitted to the Lord's Supper who make a credible profession of their faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and of obedience to His law.

ARTICLE XVII.—*Of the Ministry.* We believe that Jesus Christ, as the Supreme Head of the Church, has appointed therein a ministry of the word and sacraments, and calls men to this ministry ; that the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, recognizes and chooses those whom He calls, and should thereupon duly ordain them to the work of the ministry.

ARTICLE XVIII.—*Of Church Order and Fellowship.* We believe that the Supreme and only Head of the Church is the Lord Jesus Christ ; that its worship, teaching, discipline, and government should be administered according to His will by persons chosen for their fitness and duly set apart to their office ; and that although the visible Church may

contain unworthy members and is liable to err, yet believers ought not lightly to separate themselves from its communion, but are to live in fellowship with their brethren, which fellowship is to be extended, as God gives opportunity, to all who in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus.

ARTICLE XIX.—*Of the Resurrection, the Last Judgement, and the Future Life.* We believe that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust, through the power of the Son of God, who shall come to judge the living and the dead ; that the finally impenitent shall go away into eternal punishment and the righteous into life eternal.

ARTICLE XX.—*Of Christian Service and the Final Triumph.* We believe that it is our duty as disciples and servants of Christ, to further the extension of His kingdom, to do good unto all men, to maintain the public and private worship of God, to hallow the Lord's Day, to preserve the inviolability of marriage and the sanctity of the family, to uphold the just authority of the State, and so to live in all honesty, purity, and charity that our lives shall testify of Christ. We joyfully receive the word of Christ, bidding His people go into all the world and make disciples of all nations, declaring unto them that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, and that He will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. We confidently believe that by His power and grace all His enemies shall finally be overcome, and the kingdoms of this world be made the kingdom of our God and of His Christ.

POLITY

The Joint Committee, after an examination of the forms of church government of the negotiating Churches and the practical working thereof, is greatly gratified to find :

1. That while the officers and courts of the negotiating

Churches may bear different names, there is a substantial degree of similarity in the duties and functions of these officers and courts.

2. That, engaged in the same work, with the same object in view, and earnestly endeavouring to meet the conditions confronting the Churches in Canada, the negotiating Churches have been steadily approximating more nearly to each other, both in forms of church government and methods of administration.

3. That there are distinctive elements in each which would add to the efficiency of a united Church, and which can be preserved with great advantage in the form of polity to be adopted for The United Church.

4. That in this view it is possible to provide for substantial local freedom, and at the same time secure the benefits of a strong connexional tie and co-operative efficiency.

The following recommendations are submitted as setting forth the Polity proposed for The United Church of Canada.

I. THE CHURCH

1. The members of The United Church shall be the members of the negotiating Churches, and such others as may hereafter become members.

2. The unit of organization for The United Church shall be the Pastoral Charge. A pastoral charge may consist of more than one local church ; a local church is a body of persons meeting for public worship in one place.

3. The governing bodies or courts of the Church, higher than those of the pastoral charge, shall be :

- (a) The Presbytery.
- (b) The Conference.
- (c) The General Council.

II. THE PASTORAL CHARGE (CIRCUIT OR CONGREGATION)

A.—*Charges existing previous to the Union*

4. In the management of their local affairs the various churches, charges, circuits, or congregations of the negotiating Churches shall be entitled to continue the organization and practices (including those practices relating to membership, church ordinances, Sunday schools and Young People's Societies) enjoyed by them at the time of the union, subject in general affairs to the legislation, principles, and discipline of The United Church. Their representatives in the next higher governing body or court shall be chosen as at present.

5. The plan of organization prescribed for pastoral charges to be formed subsequent to the union may at any time be adopted by any church, charge, circuit, or congregation existing at the time of the union.

6. Subject to the provisions of the next succeeding paragraph hereof, all property, real and personal, under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada held in trust for or to the use of a church, charge, circuit, or congregation of any of the negotiating Churches, shall be held by trustees appointed by or on behalf of such church, charge, circuit, or congregation, upon trusts set forth and declared in a Model Trust Deed. This Model Trust Deed should be a schedule to the Act, and should contain, among others, a provision to the following effect: That the property is held for the church, charge, circuit, or congregation as a part of The United Church, and that no property so held shall be sold, exchanged, or in any manner encumbered, unless the Presbytery shall, at the instance of the church, charge, circuit, or congregation, have given its sanction, subject to an appeal, if desired, to the Conference.

7. Any property or funds owned by a church, charge, circuit, or congregation at the time of the union solely for

its own benefit, or vested in trustees for the sole benefit of such church, charge, circuit, or congregation, and not for the denomination of which the said church, charge, circuit, or congregation formed a part, shall not be affected by the legislation giving effect to the union or by any legislation of The United Church without the consent of the church, charge, circuit, or congregation for which such property is held in trust.

8. Churches, charges, circuits, or congregations received, subsequent to the union, into The United Church, with the approval of Presbyteries, shall be entitled, if they so desire, to the privileges of sections 4, 5 and 7.

B.—Charges to be formed subsequent to the Union

9. The liberty of the pastoral charge shall be recognized to the fullest extent compatible with :

(a) The oversight of the spiritual interests of the charge by the minister (or ministers) and a body of men specially chosen and set apart or ordained for that work, who shall jointly constitute the session ;

(b) The efficient co-operation of the representatives of the various departments of the work of the charge by means of a meeting to be held at least quarterly ;

(c) The hearty co-operation of the various pastoral charges in the general work of the Church, and

(d) The exercise by the higher governing bodies or courts of their powers and functions, hereinafter set forth.

10. New pastoral charges or local churches shall be formed with the consent of a Presbytery by persons residing within its bounds, who declare their adherence to the principles of The United Church, and their desire for the formation of such charge or church. Missions may be organized as pastoral charges by Presbytery of its own motion, or on the suggestion of the Missionary Superintendent or the Minister, under such regulations as the General Council may pass.

Before sanctioning the formation of a pastoral charge or local church, the Presbytery shall be required to hear and consider the representations of any pastoral charge that may be affected by the proposed action.

11. (a) The members of the Church entitled to all church privileges are those who, on a profession of their faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him, have been received into full membership. The children of such persons and all baptized children are members of the Church, and it is their duty and privilege, when they reach the age of discretion, to enter into full membership. Admission to full membership, and granting of certificates of removal, shall be by the action of the session, and by the action of those in full membership where desired by the pastoral charge.

(b) The members of a local church who are entitled to vote at all meetings are persons in full membership, whose names are on the roll of the church. With the consent of these, adherents who contribute regularly to the support of the church may vote on temporal matters.

12. The members of a local church shall meet annually, and more frequently if they deem it advisable.

13. The Session shall have oversight of the spiritual interests of the pastoral charge. The management of its temporal and financial affairs shall be entrusted to a Committee of Stewards. The Official Board, consisting of the Session and Committee of Stewards, with representatives in full church membership of such other departments of church work as may be agreed upon by the General Council, shall meet quarterly, and more frequently if they deem it advisable, for the consideration of matters of joint interest.

14. The members of the session, other than the minister, shall be chosen by those in full church membership, and shall hold office under regulations to be passed by the General Council.

15. (a) It shall be the duty of the session to have the oversight of :

(1) The admission of persons into full membership, and the granting of certificates of removal.

(2) The conduct of members, with power to exercise discipline.

(3) The administration of the sacraments.

(4) The religious training of the young, and the organization of meetings for Christian fellowship, instruction, and work.

(5) The order of public worship, including the service of praise and the use of the church edifice.

(6) The care of the poor, and the visiting of the sick.

(b) It shall also be its duty :

(7) To receive and judge petitions, &c., from members.

(8) To transmit petitions, appeals, &c., to Presbytery.

(9) To recommend suitable laymen to Presbyteries for licence to preach.

(10) To recommend suitable candidates for the ministry.

16. The stewards shall be chosen by the local church, and, wherever practicable, should be persons in full membership.

It shall be the duty of the Committee of Stewards to secure contributions for the purposes of the local church, and to disburse the moneys received for these purposes.

17. It shall be the duty of the Official Board :

(1) To secure contributions for missionary and other general objects of the Church.

(2) To select representatives, in full church membership, of the pastoral charge to the Presbytery.

(3) To submit to the pastoral charge or local church for its consideration reports on life and work, including a full statement of receipts and expenditures, of indebtedness and of estimates for the ensuing year.

(4) To transmit from the pastoral charge, through the

Presbytery, to the Settlement Committee, representations concerning the pastoral relation.

(5) To attend to matters affecting the pastoral charge not assigned to any of the other bodies.

18. All lands, premises, and property acquired for the use of a local church or a pastoral charge of The United Church, shall be held, used, and administered under the trusts of the above Model Trust Deed. (See ' Polity,' par. 6).

III. THE PRESBYTERY

19. The Presbytery shall consist of :

(1) The ordained ministers within the bounds—

(a) Who are engaged in some department of church work ;
and

(b) Who have been placed on the roll by special enactment of the Conference in accordance with regulations to be made by the General Council.

(The rights to membership in Presbyteries, District Meetings, and Associations, enjoyed by ministers at the time of the union, shall be conserved.)

(2) The elders, deacons, leaders or other non-ministerial representatives of pastoral charges, within the bounds, equal in number to the number of ministers, and chosen in accordance with regulations to be made by the General Council.

20. It shall be the duty of the Presbytery :

(1) To have the oversight of the pastoral charges within its bounds, review their records, and form new pastoral charges, or local churches.

(2) To receive and dispose of petitions and appeals from the lower governing bodies or courts.

(3) To transmit petitions and appeals to the higher governing bodies or courts.

(4) To license as preachers laymen who are duly recommended and who after examination are approved.

(5) To superintend the education of students looking forward to the ministry, and to certify them to theological colleges.

(6) To inquire, each year, into the personal character, doctrinal beliefs and general fitness of candidates for the ministry, recommended by sessions, official boards, or local churches; and, when they have fulfilled the prescribed requirements, to license them to preach and to recommend them for the ordination of the Conference.

(7) To induct or install ministers.

(8) To deal with matters sent down by the higher governing bodies or courts.

(9) To adopt measures for promoting the religious life of the pastoral charges within its bounds.

(10) To select non-ministerial representatives to the Conference, of whom at least a majority shall have been previously chosen by pastoral charges to represent them in Presbyteries, and to nominate representatives on the Conference Settlement Committee.

(11) To have the oversight of the conduct of ministers within its bounds.

IV. THE CONFERENCE

21. The Conference shall consist of the ministers on the rolls of the Presbyteries within its bounds, and an equal number of non-ministerial representatives of pastoral charges chosen as provided for in subsection 20 (par. 10).

22. It shall be the duty of the Conference :

(1) To meet every year.

(2) To determine the number and boundaries of the Presbyteries within its bounds, have oversight of them, and review their records.

(3) To receive and dispose of appeals and petitions, subject to the usual right of appeal.

(4) To see that, as far as possible, every pastoral charge

within its bounds shall have a pastorate without interruption, and that every effective minister shall have a pastoral charge, and to effect this through a Settlement Committee which it shall appoint annually.

(5) To examine and ordain candidates for the ministry who have fulfilled the prescribed requirements and have been recommended by Presbyteries.

(6) To receive ministers from other Churches subject to the regulations of the General Council.

(7) To deal with matters referred to it by the General Council.

(8) To select an equal number of ministerial and non-ministerial representatives to the General Council.

(9) To have oversight of the religious life of the Church within its bounds, and to adopt such measures as may be judged necessary for its promotion.

V. THE GENERAL COUNCIL

23. The General Council shall consist of an equal number of ministers and non-ministerial representatives chosen by the Conferences. Its regular meeting shall be held every second year. Its presiding officer shall be the chief executive officer of the Church, and during his term of office he may be relieved of his pastoral or other duties.

24. The General Council shall have full power :

(1) To determine the number and boundaries of the Conferences, have oversight of them, and review their records.

(2) (a) To legislate on matters respecting the doctrine, worship, membership, and government of the Church, subject to the conditions : First, that before any rule or law relative to these matters can become a permanent law, it must receive the approval of a majority of the Presbyteries, and, if advisable, pastoral charges also ; Second, that

no terms of admission to full membership shall be described other than those laid down in the New Testament ; and, Third, that the freedom of worship at present enjoyed in the negotiating Churches shall not be interfered with in The United Church.

(b) To legislate on all matters respecting property, subject to the limitations elsewhere provided in this Basis of Union, and subject also to the approval of the Conference in which the property is situated.

(3) To prescribe and regulate the course of study of candidates for the ministry and to regulate the admission of ministers from other Churches.

(4) To receive and dispose of petitions, memorials, &c.

(5) To dispose of appeals.

(6) To determine the missionary policy of the Church, and to provide for the conduct of its missions.

(7) To have charge of the colleges of the Church, and to take what measures are deemed advisable for the promotion of Christian education.

(8) To appoint committees or boards and officers for the different departments of church work, and to receive their reports and give them instructions and authority.

(9) To correspond with other Churches.

(10) And in general to enact such legislation and adopt such measures as may tend to promote true godliness, repress immorality, preserve the unity and well-being of the Church, and advance the kingdom of Christ throughout the world.

THE MINISTRY

I. PASTORAL OFFICE, INCLUDING TERM OF SERVICE

Recognizing the desirability of preserving the essence of both the settled pastorate and the itinerancy, the Joint Committee is of the opinion that a harmony of both principles is possible, and that the best features of both

systems may be retained. We, therefore, recommend as follows :

1. The pastoral relation shall be without a time limit.
2. The policy of the Church shall be that every pastoral charge shall have, as far as possible, a pastorate without interruption, and that every effective minister shall have a pastoral charge.
3. There shall be for each Conference a Settlement Committee, consisting of ministers and laymen, and appointed annually by the Conference. On this Committee each Presbytery shall be represented. It shall be the duty of this Committee to consider all applications for settlement from ministers and pastoral charges within the district over which it has jurisdiction. For this purpose it shall meet annually before the meeting of the Conference next after that by which it was appointed.
4. A minister by his own action and a pastoral charge through its constitutional representatives may, by such a date before the annual meeting of the Settlement Committee as the General Council shall determine, seek a change of pastoral relation by means of an application through the Presbytery to the Settlement Committee. All such applications shall be in writing.
5. Any pastoral charge, in view of a vacancy, may extend a call or invitation to any properly qualified minister or ministers, but the right of appointment shall rest with the Settlement Committee, which shall report to the Conference for information only.
6. (a) When a pastoral charge about to become vacant at the end of the Conference year, fails to give a call or invitation within the time specified by the General Council, the Settlement Committee shall make the appointment.
(b) When a pastoral charge becomes vacant during the Conference year through death or other emergency, the Presbytery concerned shall confer with the charge itself or

with its constitutional representatives, and thereafter may arrange a supply for the remainder of the Conference year.

7. The Settlement Committee shall also have authority to initiate correspondence with ministers and pastoral charges with a view to completing arrangements to secure necessary and desirable settlements.

(a) Any minister shall have the right to appear before the Settlement Committee to represent his case in regard to his appointment ; and any pastoral charge or Official Board may also appear by not more than two representatives, properly authorized in writing, appointed from among its members at a regular meeting, or at a special meeting of which proper notice has been given ;

(b) When a minister chosen by a pastoral charge cannot be settled, the charge or its constitutional representatives may place other names before the Settlement Committee :

(c) While the right of appointment shall rest with the Settlement Committee it shall comply as far as possible with the expressed wishes of ministers and pastoral charges.

8. There shall also be a committee for the transfer of ministers from one Conference to another, which may be composed of the presiding officer of the General Council of the Church, who shall be the convener and chairman of the committee, together with the presiding officers of the several Conferences. This committee shall have authority to transfer ministers and candidates for the ministry from one Conference to another, in harmony with the plan outlined in sections 3-7.

9. The minister in charge shall be the presiding officer of the Session and of the Official Board.

10. Every minister or candidate for the ministry, duly appointed regular pastor to a pastoral charge, shall have the right to conduct services in the church, churches or other

places of worship in connexion with said charge ; and the right of occupancy of the manse or parsonage in connexion with said charge, subject, however, to the rules and regulations of The United Church.

II. TRAINING FOR THE MINISTRY

1. No candidate for the ministry shall be received unless he has been first recommended by a session, official board, or local church.

2. The duty of inquiry into the personal character, doctrinal beliefs, and general fitness of candidates for the ministry recommended by sessions, official boards, or local churches, shall be laid upon the Presbytery and such inquiry shall be repeated each year until they are recommended to the Conference for ordination.

3. (1) The attainment of a B.A. degree including Greek, to be followed by three years in the study of Theology, is strongly recommended by the Church. Before ordination every candidate shall spend twelve months in preaching and pastoral work.

(2) In cases where the B.A. degree is unattainable, there shall be two alternative courses, both starting from University matriculation.

(a) Three years, at least, in Arts, followed by three years in Theology. Before ordination every candidate shall spend twelve months in preaching and pastoral work.

(b) Two years' preaching under the supervision of a Presbytery, with appropriate studies, and four years of a mixed Arts and Theological course in college.

4. *Suggested Curricula :*

(1) Course of study in Arts under (2) (a). English Language and Literature, three years. Two languages, one of which must be Greek, two years in each.

Philosophy, including Psychology, Logic and Ethics two

years, two other subjects from the Arts curriculum at the option of the student—one year in each.

(2) Course of study under (2) (b) :

(a) While under supervision of Presbytery, and engaged in preaching for two years :

English Bible ; New Testament in Greek ; Elements of Theology—Life of Christ ; History of Missions ; English Literature ; Practical Training, including preparation of sermons.

(b) Four years of mixed Arts and Theological Course in College.

The Arts Course. English Language and Literature ; Philosophy, including Psychology ; Logic and Ethics ; one language ; any one option from the Arts Course.

Theological Course. Homiletics ; Pastoral Theology ; Systematic Theology ; New Testament Languages and Literature ; Old Testament Literature (English Bible) ; Church History ; Christian Ethics and Sociology.

5. The following is suggested as a comprehensive course in Theology, from which may be selected subjects sufficient to constitute the three years' course in Theology as under 3 (1) and (2) (a) :

Old Testament Language and Literature, including Textual Criticism. Exegesis, Biblical Theology, Introduction, Old Testament History and Old Testament Canon ; New Testament Language and Literature, including Textual Criticism. Exegesis, Biblical Theology, Introduction, New Testament History and New Testament Canon ; English Bible ; Church History, including Symbolics ; Systematic Theology ; Apologetics, including Philosophy of Religion, History of Religion, and Comparative Religion ; Christian Ethics and Sociology ; Christian Missions ; Practical Training, including preparation and delivery of sermons, preparation for and conduct of public worship, administration of the Sacraments, Church Law, the art of

teaching and Sunday-school work, public speaking and voice training. Practical Training is to be understood to include not only instruction in these subjects but actual drill wherever the subject admits of it.

6. Provision shall be made in the Theological Colleges for instruction in the subjects of the above suggested course in Theology as far as practicable.

7. In every College special attention shall be given to Practical Training as specified and described above.

8. From the above (5) comprehensive course in Theology the Church shall prescribe certain subjects as compulsory, leaving others to the option of the students in consultation with the College authorities.

9. Candidates for the ministry who have entered on their course in Theology shall be allowed to complete it on the conditions which obtained when they began, but this privilege shall expire within three years from the date of the union.

10. The General Council shall possess the power of ordaining any person to the ministry if it sees fit so to do.

III. THE RELATIONS OF A MINISTER TO THE DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH

1. The duty of final inquiry into the personal character, doctrinal beliefs, and general fitness of candidates for the Ministry presenting themselves for ordination or for reception as ministers of The United Church shall be laid upon the Conference.

2. These candidates shall be examined on the Statement of Doctrine of The United Church, and shall, before ordination, satisfy the examining body that they are in essential agreement therewith, and that as ministers of the Church they accept the statement as in substance agreeable to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures.

3. Further, in the ordination service before the Conference these candidates shall answer the following questions :

(1) Do you believe yourself to be a child of God, through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ ?

(2) Do you believe yourself to be called of God to the office of the Christian ministry, and your chief motives to be zeal for the glory of God, love for the Lord Jesus Christ, and desire for the salvation of men ?

(3) Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrines required for eternal salvation in our Lord Jesus Christ, and are you resolved out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing which is not agreeable thereto ?

ADMINISTRATION

The Joint Committee, after careful consideration of the Missionary, Educational, and other connexional enterprises of the negotiating Churches, submits the following recommendations in relation thereto :

I. MISSIONS

1. In the administration of the mission work of The United Church there shall be two departments : (a) Home, including all the mission work within the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, and the Bermudas ; (b) Foreign, including the missions already established or that may be established in other countries.

2. For the oversight and administration of these two departments there shall be two Boards to be known as the Board of Home Missions and the Board of Foreign Missions, to be elected in such a manner and endowed with such powers as the General Council may determine.

3. In recognition of the very valuable services rendered

by the Women's Missionary Societies, the union, constitution, and lines of work of these societies shall be determined by the joint action of their Boards, subject to the approval of the General Council.

4. There shall be placed under the administration of the Home Mission Board of The United Church the moneys now administered under the caption of the Sustentation Fund and Church and Parsonage Aid Fund of the Methodist Church; the Home Mission and Augmentation Funds, French Evangelization Fund, and Church and Manse Fund (except that under the Foreign Mission Board) of the Presbyterian Church; the Home Mission Fund of the Congregational Churches; and such portion of the Mission Fund now raised by the Methodist Church, and the Foreign Mission Board of the Presbyterian Church, as is now expended in Canada, Newfoundland, and the Bermudas.

5. There shall be placed under the administration of the Foreign Mission Board of The United Church the Foreign Mission Fund of the Congregational Churches and that portion of the Mission Fund of the Methodist Church and of the Foreign Mission Fund of the Presbyterian Church now expended in other lands.

6. There shall be placed under the administration of the Board of Social Service and Evangelism and the Board of Sunday Schools and Young People's Societies of The United Church the funds now raised for the work of the Departments of Social Service and Evangelism and the Departments of Sunday Schools and Young People's Societies of the negotiating churches.

7. Inasmuch as certain expenses in connexion with the various courts of the Church will have to be met, the ways and means of raising these funds shall be left to the General Council.

II. PUBLISHING INTERESTS

It shall be left to the General Council of The United Church to determine how far the publications now issued by the negotiating Churches shall be amalgamated.¹

III. COLLEGES

The Colleges at present connected with the negotiating Churches exist, each under its own charter, and in various relations to the respective Churches. These relations affect, first, the appointment of the Governing Board, second, the appointment of Professors in the Faculty of Theology; third, assistance or maintainance from funds controlled by the Church.

1. All the Colleges connected with the three negotiating Churches shall, as far as possible, sustain the same relation to The United Church as, under their charter, they now sustain to the respective churches, until the General

¹ The periodicals published by the Methodist Church are as follows: *Christian Guardian* (weekly), Toronto; *Epworth Era* (monthly), Toronto; *The Missionary Outlook* (monthly), Toronto; *The Wesleyan* (weekly), Halifax, and a Series of Sabbath School Illustrated Papers and Lesson Helps for Teachers and Scholars.

By the Presbyterian Church: *The Presbyterian Record* (monthly), Montreal, and a Series of Sabbath School Illustrated Papers and Lesson Helps for Teachers and Scholars.

The *Congregationalist*, a weekly paper, is published by the Publication Department of the Congregational Union of Canada.

The Methodist Church also possesses a printing plant, and carries on a general publishing business—'The Methodist Book Room,' Toronto—the Eastern section of the Book Committee owning the property in Halifax in which the business is transacted.

The relation of the publishing interests of the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches to their respective Churches and the general methods of management are similar in each case, save that in the case of the Methodist Book concern, allocation of profits is made to the Superannuation Fund.

Council shall determine otherwise and necessary legislation shall give effect to changes made thereby.

2. The policy of the Church shall be the maintenance of a limited number of thoroughly equipped Colleges, due regard being paid to the needs of different parts of the country, and in furtherance of this policy amalgamation shall be effected as soon as possible in localities where two or more Colleges are doing the same class of work.

3. In addition to the Governing Boards of the several Colleges there shall be appointed by the General Council a Board of Education, which shall have such a general oversight of the Educational interests of the Church as the General Council may assign to it, and carry out such measures as may be decided in reference thereto.

4. There shall be a general Educational Fund, administered by the Board of Education, for the purpose of supplementing the revenues of the several colleges and assisting students in their preparation for the ministry, and for such other purposes and under such regulations as the General Council may from time to time determine.

5. The several educational institutions shall be encouraged to obtain permanent endowments for their maintenance, may receive contributions for this and other purposes at any time, and, upon receiving the consent of the Board of Education, may proceed to appeal for such funds.

IV. BENEVOLENT FUNDS

Whereas there exist, in some form, in all the negotiating Churches funds to aid aged and retired ministers, and widows and orphans of ministers, provision for similar purposes shall be made in the constitution of The United Church by such amalgamation or modification of existing methods as may be found practicable ; and such provision shall embrace the following particulars :

1. The rights of present and prospective claimants on existing funds in any of the negotiating churches shall be adequately protected. To this end :

(1) The present capital investments of the various benevolent funds of the negotiating Churches, and the income now contributed to those funds by publishing interests shall be combined into a 'common trust', if practicable. The rights of present claimants and of prospective claimants (the latter being computed as of the date of the union) shall be a first charge on the revenue from this trust. If it be found that differences in the constitution and administration of the several funds are such as to necessitate separate trusts, instead of a common trust, this shall not be a bar to the carrying out of the general plan, because in that case their revenues shall be combined.

(2) The General Council of The United Church shall provide for (a) the assessing of each minister who is a member of any of the existing funds at the date of the union and of all ministers received into or ordained in The United Church after the union, on the basis of stipend or age, or both stipend and age, as the General Council may determine, and (b) the collecting of contributions, which shall be obligatory upon all local churches, based upon an equitable allocation or assessment under the rules to be formulated by the General Council, the minimum of such allocation or assessment being the amount which, together with the revenue from said trust or trusts and the foregoing assessment upon ministers, is requisite to make good the claims of claimants upon the Superannuation Fund to be instituted by the General Council.

2. Claimants on the proposed Fund shall include the following :

(a) All ministers who, at the time of the union, are beneficiaries of existing funds ;

(b) All ministers who, at the time of the union, are regular

contributors to existing funds on the scale provided by their respective denominations ;

(c) All ministers' widows and orphans who are now, or may hereafter become, entitled to participate in the proposed Fund ;

(d) All ministers, not members of or contributors to existing funds, who may signify their desire to become members of and contributors to the proposed Fund, on the basis of payments sanctioned by the General Council of The United Church.

Provision shall be made whereby ministers so applying may, by a certain scale of payments, be entitled to have their claim upon the proposed Fund date from the time of their reception into the ministry of any of the negotiating Churches instead of from the date of the union.

(e) All ministers received into or ordained in the Church after the union inasmuch as they shall be required at the time of their reception or ordination to become members of and contributors to the proposed Fund.

3. The sources of revenue of the proposed Fund shall be the following :

(a) Contributions of ministers who are members of said Fund at its inception, or afterwards become such, on a scale to be adopted by the General Council of the Church.

(b) Offerings in all local churches based upon an equitable allocation to be made by the Board of Management of said Fund, under regulations sanctioned by the General Council.

(c) Legacies and donations given for the purpose.

(d) Such grants from the profits of the publishing interests of the Church as may from time to time be determined under regulations to be framed by the General Council.

(e) Proceeds of any investments that may be made in the interests of the said Fund.

APPENDIX ON LAW

1. When a Basis of Union has been agreed upon by the negotiating Churches, the union should be consummated and The United Church incorporated by a Special Act of the Parliament of Canada.

2. The Act of the Parliament of Canada consummating the Union and incorporating The United Church should contain, among others, provisions to the following effect :

(1) Ratifying and confirming the Basis of Union as agreed upon, and empowering The United Church to acquire and hold property.

(2) Making clear (a) that The United Church shall have the powers of legislation mentioned in sub-paragraph (2) of paragraph 24 of the Polity Section of the Basis of Union, subject to the safeguards thereby imposed, in such full and ample manner as to render impossible the existence in connexion with The United Church of the conditions which have arisen in Scotland in connexion with The United Free Church of Scotland, under the decision of the House of Lords, touching its property and doctrine.

(b) That all the estate, real and personal, belonging to or held in trust for or to the use of the negotiating Churches, or belonging to or held in trust for or to the use of any corporation under the government or control of, or in connexion with, any of the said negotiating Churches, shall be vested in The United Church or in Boards, Committees or Corporations under the control thereof, and shall be used and administered in accordance with the terms and provisions of the Basis of Union.¹

Note. This provision would cover all property which might properly be described as denominational property.

¹ At a meeting of the Presbyterian Union Committee held on December 15, 1914, it was resolved that 'it is expected that in the proposed legislation proper provision will be made to guard the rights or privileges of any minority which may be opposed to Union.'

(c) That, subject to the provisions of the next succeeding paragraph hereof, all property, real and personal, under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada held in trust for or to the use of a church, charge, circuit, or congregation of any of the negotiating Churches, shall be held by trustees appointed by or on behalf of such church, charge, circuit, or congregation, upon trusts set forth and declared in a Model Trust Deed.

This Model Trust Deed should be a schedule to the Act, and should contain, among others, a provision to the following effect: That the property is held for the church, charge, circuit, or congregation as a part of The United Church, and that no property so held shall be sold, exchanged, or in any manner encumbered unless the Presbytery shall, at the instance of the church, charge, circuit, or congregation, have given its sanction, subject to an appeal, if desired, to the Conference.

(d) That any property or funds owned by a church, charge, circuit, or congregation at the time of the union solely for its own benefit, or vested in trustees for the sole benefit of such church, charge, circuit, or congregation, and not for the denomination of which the said church, charge, circuit, or congregation formed a part, shall not be affected by the legislation giving effect to the union or by any legislation of The United Church without the consent of the church, charge, circuit, or congregation for which said property is held in trust.

Note. To avoid uncertainty as to title, all churches, charges, circuits, or congregations coming within the provision of this clause should be named in a schedule attached to the Act, and the provisions of this section should be limited to the churches, charges, circuits, or congregations so enumerated in the schedule.

(e) That all lands, premises, and property acquired for the use of a local church or a pastoral charge of The

United Church shall be held, used, and administered upon the trusts of the said Model Trust Deed above referred to.

3. Special acts of the Legislatures of the several Provinces of the Dominion and of Newfoundland and the Bermudas and any other country in which the negotiating Churches hold property should be obtained, containing similar provisions and vesting in the manner above indicated the above and like classes of property and interests over which the said Legislatures may respectively have jurisdiction, and rendering effective in the said several jurisdictions the other provisions relating to the said union.

XV. SOUTH INDIA

71. Statement drawn up by Thirty-three Ministers of the Anglican and South India United Churches at Tranquebar, May 1 and 2, 1919

[The South India United Church (constituted in 1908) was formed by the union of Christian congregations connected with five separate missions in South India: the London Missionary Society and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (both Congregational), the Church of Scotland, the United Free Church of Scotland, and the Dutch Reformed Church in America. Congregations of the Basel Mission were also later incorporated.]

We, as individual members of the Anglican Communion and the South India United Church, having met at Tranquebar in the first Ministers' Conference on church union, after prayer, thought, and discussion, have agreed on the following statement concerning the union of the Anglican Church with the South India United Church:

We believe that the union is the will of God, even as our Lord prayed that we might be one, that the world might believe. We believe that union is the teaching of Scripture. 'There is one body, and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all.'

We believe that the challenge of the present hour in the period of reconstruction after the war, in the gathering together of the nations, and the present critical situation in India itself, call us to mourn our past divisions and turn to our Lord Jesus Christ to seek in Him the unity of the body expressed in one visible Church. We face together the titanic task of the winning of India for Christ—one-fifth

of the human race. Yet, confronted by such an overwhelming responsibility, we find ourselves rendered weak and relatively impotent by our unhappy divisions—divisions for which we were not responsible, and which have been, as it were, imposed upon us from without ; divisions which we did not create, and which we do not desire to perpetuate.

In this Church we believe that three Scriptural elements must be conserved: (1) The *Congregational* element, representing 'the whole Church', with 'every member' having immediate access to God, each exercising his gift for the development of the whole body. (2) We believe it should include the delegated, organized, or *Presbyterian* element, whereby the Church could unite in a General Assembly, Synods or Councils in organized unity. (3) We believe it should include the representative, executive, or *Episcopal* element. Thus all three elements, no one of which is absolute or sufficient without the others, should be included in the Church of the future, for we aim not at compromise for the sake of peace, but at comprehension for the sake of truth.

In seeking union, the Anglican members present stand for the one ultimate principle of *the historic Episcopate*. They ask the 'acceptance of the fact of episcopacy and not any theory as to its character'. The South India United Church members believe it is 'a necessary condition that the Episcopate *should reassume a constitutional form*' on the primitive, simple, apostolic model. While the Anglicans ask for the historic Episcopate, the members of the South India United Church also make one condition of union, namely, the recognition of *spiritual equality*, of the universal priesthood of all believers, and of the rights of the laity to their full expression in the Church. They ask that this principle of spiritual equality shall be maintained throughout at every step of the negotiations.

Upon this common ground of the historic Episcopate and of spiritual equality of all members of the two Churches, we propose union on the following basis :

- (1) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as containing all things necessary to salvation.
- (2) The Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed.
- (3) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

We understand that the acceptance of the fact of the Episcopate does not involve the acceptance of any theory of the origin of episcopacy nor any doctrinal interpretation of the fact. It is further agreed that the terms of union should involve no Christian community in the necessity of disowning its past, and we find it no part of our duty to call in question the validity of each other's orders.

Fully recognizing that we do not commit our respective bodies to any action, we individually and unofficially agree upon the following plan of union : After full deliberation, let the South India United Church, if it desires union, choose from its own members certain men who shall be consecrated as bishops. In the consecration of these first bishops it is suggested that three or more bishops of the Anglican Church shall lay their hands upon the candidates, together with an equal number of ministers as representatives of the South India United Church.

As soon as the first bishops are consecrated, the two bodies would be in intercommunion, but the further limitation of existing ministers with regard to celebrating the Communion in the churches of the other body might still remain. In accordance with the principle of spiritual equality we desire to find some means to permit ministers of either body to celebrate the Communion in the churches of the other body.

While not committing our respective bodies, we, un-

officially and individually, with the blessing of God, agree to work towards union on such a basis.

As one possible solution, we would suggest that a special Service of *Commission* should be held. All ministers of both bodies desiring authority to officiate at the Communion throughout the whole Church should present themselves to receive at the hands of all the bishops of the United Churches a commission for such celebration of the Communion. Ministers of either body not desiring to officiate at the Communion in the other Church would be under no obligation to present themselves. Full liberty would be claimed for individuals on the extreme wing of each body to maintain their present views and practices.

72. Statement from the Malabar Suffragan and other Members of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church

JUNE 1919.

[No action has been taken as yet (1924) by the authorities of this Church.]

As individual members of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church, we have received an invitation from certain pastors of the Anglican Communion and of the South India United Church who met at Tranquebar, May 1 and 2, 1919, in the Ministers' Conference on Church Union, requesting the members of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church prayerfully to consider with them the question of uniting the divided Churches of Christ in India. This appeals to us the more deeply, as we ourselves have been praying fervently for years for the healing of the sad divisions which have rent asunder the Church of Christ. These divisions have been particularly disastrous and destructive in India, where the Church has at times become almost a byword among the non-Christians, where religion which was meant to unite mankind has actually divided it.

We agree with you that union is the will of God, and that instead of being responsible for perpetuating the divisions of Christ's Church, we should seek to answer our Lord's prayer that we all may be one.

We also believe that the awakening of a new national consciousness in India, and the entry upon a new era of responsible government, makes it imperative that the Church also, instead of wasting its strength in internal strife, should face the new conditions and work for unity in order to meet the overwhelming demand of the hour. After centuries of the bitter experience of disunion, we, like yourselves, do not desire to perpetuate such divisions.

We are glad to see that you propose union not on any basis of compromise but on one of comprehension, where each body shall contribute its treasures and tradition to the enrichment of the whole. We understand that you do not ask us to change our long-cherished convictions, principles, and practices which we have maintained for centuries in the face of bitter persecution. We also understand that you do not ask us to surrender our autonomy or lose our freedom of action in things pertaining to our own communion.

We see that you propose union on the basis of four articles, and by two definite methods, with all of which we find ourselves in hearty agreement. In the Constitution of our Church all the four articles mentioned are incorporated as the unchangeable fundamentals of our faith.

1. We have held that the Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary for salvation, and have stood for the principle of the open Bible, which has never been forbidden to the people.

2. We have always held the Nicene Creed, and it forms a part of our regular services. While we accept all the doctrines contained in the Apostles' Creed, it has not been our practice to use it in formal worship.

3. We have always held the two sacraments of Baptism

and the Lord's Supper, administered with Christ's words of institution and the elements He used.

4. We have always stood strongly for maintaining the historic Episcopate, but we agree with you that it is no part of our duty to call in question the validity of each other's orders.

A brief statement of the history of our ancient Church will serve to show our position with regard to the above articles, and our attitude toward them.

We have always held firmly to the tradition that our Church was founded by St. Thomas, the Apostle of Christ, in the first century. Many historians, both ancient and modern, have adduced evidence in support of this tradition, but whether or not it can be proved historically, it is certain that following the fourth century there is undoubted proof that a strong and influential Church existed in South India as shown by its monuments, ancient Persian inscriptions, copperplate characters, and statements of travellers and historians.

In the year A. D. 345 a large emigration of Christians from Syria arrived. During the following centuries connexion was maintained with the Eastern Churches. In the period of strong Nestorian Missions to Asia the Church for a time would seem to have been related to the Bishops of Persia. From A. D. 1054, when the Western and Eastern Churches divided, we stood with the Eastern Churches and maintained the original wording of the Nicene Creed, objecting to the later Western insertion of the single word *filioque* (from the Son). We even now say that the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father is worshipped with the Father and the Son (St. John xv. 26). While under this controversy there lay deep race prejudice between the East and the West, and the firm refusal of the East to admit the growing exclusive claims of the Papacy, we nevertheless feel to-day that it is

incomprehensible to think of perpetuating the division of the Church of Christ, and shattering its strength over a contention about a word. Confronted to-day by the call to return to our original obligation of winning the world, we find ourselves united by a common task, and in the very presence of Christ our Lord lifted to a plane which transcends the medieval dissensions which formerly divided us. A century ago a mission of help was sent by the Anglican Church which led to the quickening and vitalizing of our own isolated communion. Deeply indebted as we are for the self-denying labours of the representatives of the Anglican Church on our behalf, we are all the more glad that the proposal for union comes also from the Church to which we have been so long indebted.

We believe that it is under the guidance of the Spirit that union is now proposed between the Anglican, Syrian, and Free Church bodies. This would unite three Churches representing the Western Catholic, the Eastern Catholic, and the Free Protestant Churches. It would be the first instance in history where union has been effected between the East and the West, between Catholic and Protestant, between episcopal and non-episcopal bodies. The prayer of centuries would thus be answered.

We are ready to consider union now that a definite proposal has come from members of the Anglican and South India United Churches. As the Church of England has for three decades suggested conditions for union, we hope that our Synod will also favourably consider the same and take steps for effecting union upon this common ground. We understand that there is no question of the absorption of one Church by another, but that standing on the principle of spiritual equality before our common Lord, we shall each seek to contribute the riches of our own spiritual inheritance to the United Church of the future. We shall be glad if this

union brings the long-desired dawn of a new day of Christian unity, when there shall be neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither East nor West, but as our Lord prayed we shall all be one in Him.

While writing unofficially without committing our Metropolitan and the Synod of our Church, which will have to take final action upon the matter, we as individual members of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church, with the blessing of God, agree to pray and work toward union upon such a basis.

ABRAHAM MAR THOMA (*Malabar Suffragan*).

C. P. PHILIPOSE.

V. P. MAMMAN.,

XX. REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM

89. Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Archbishops and Metropolitans of the Anglican Communion

LAMBETH PALACE.

Christmas, 1923.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP,

More than three years have passed since the Lambeth Conference of 1920, and I am told on many sides that it would be a good thing that I should send to the Metropolitans of our Communion a brief summary of the position, as I view it, of the Reunion question, which has during these years been astir.

This letter is not in any strict sense official. It is merely a brief summary of what seem to me personally to be the present features of the scene or 'movement' viewed from an advantageous standpoint. You will pardon me if, for the sake of clearness, I go over some very familiar ground.

1. Start from the Lambeth Conference of 1920. Its Report, with special emphasis upon the 'Appeal to All Christian People', to which we had agreed with almost complete unanimity, was, as you know, circulated in many languages and in many lands. The Metropolitans throughout the Anglican Communion have no doubt, in accordance with the request of the Conference, taken steps within their respective areas to confer upon the subject with the local leaders of other churches. Besides this, it was my privilege to send copies officially to the heads of other leading churches throughout the world, and the replies from every quarter, Eastern and Western, and from the English-speaking

Churches and Denominations at home and overseas, were uniformly courteous and were sometimes even eager in their expressions of cordiality and hope.

Much has passed during these years with regard to Reunion, and not all of it bears directly upon the Lambeth 'Appeal', but that 'Appeal' has in all cases formed a background to what has been done and said.

2. I would remind you that here in England, within a few weeks of our transmitting the Appeal to the authorities of the different Free Churches, a series of Conferences began to be held at Lambeth between leaders officially appointed by the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches and a number of English Bishops. I think I am not exaggerating when I say that these Conferences in their composition, their character and their purpose, have no precedent in the history of the Church in these Islands. The Archbishop of York has throughout taken the lead in the discussions, and I cannot sufficiently express the debt owed by the whole Church to the wisdom, determination, and patience with which he has guided the spokesmen on the different sides and assisted them in their efforts to reach agreement in the truth.

You will remember that the first Report of the subjects discussed and agreed upon at these Conferences was issued in May 1922, over the joint signatures of the two Archbishops and the Moderator of the Federal Council. It treated the crucial topics of the Nature of the Church, the Ministry, and the Place of the Creed in a United Church, and was published by S.P.C.K. under the title of *Church Unity*. On the basis of that Report, and with the full co-operation of the Federal Council, further Conferences have taken place during the past twelve months on the 'Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry'. The Anglican members of the Joint Conference, after repeated discussion with the Free Church representatives and with one another, presented a long Memorandum on that subject to the Federal Council,

which in its turn issued last September a statement of the Free Church position, and again expressed the desire that the Conferences should be resumed. The whole of these documents have now been issued in a single pamphlet published by S.P.C.K. under the title, '*Reunion. The Lambeth Conference Report and the Free Churches.*'

In addition to this I myself addressed the Wesleyan Conference at Bristol this year on the subject of Christian Unity; and the Archbishop of York has personally commended the 'Appeal' to the Annual Assemblies of the Baptist Union, the Presbyterian Church of England, and also the Wesleyan Conference. All these Churches, as well as others, have passed Resolutions of general welcome to the 'Appeal'. The Wesleyan Conference has adopted a considered reply of its own.

3. In Scotland the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland have been, and are still, engaged on their own union movement, and the time is not yet ripe for the initiation of the formal communications with ourselves, which they have expressed their readiness to take in hand in due course. Meantime I have had the honour, together with the Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Bishop of Peterborough, of addressing the General Assembly of each Church on the Lambeth Conference Report, and each Church, after consideration in Committee, adopted a careful and friendly response to the 'Appeal'.

It seems to me therefore that we have a right, with thankfulness to Almighty God, to regard the position, in Great Britain itself, as fraught with abundant hope. There can be no question that the leaders upon all sides, and through them the officers, clerical and lay, of the respective Churches are disposed in quite a novel degree to appreciate one another's position and to look forward to a yet nearer approach.

4. From overseas, reports steadily reach Lambeth, sometimes from the Metropolitans themselves, sometimes in other

ways, showing the eager welcome which the 'Appeal to All Christian People' has received both in non-Episcopal and in Episcopal Churches. To remind you of only a few instances: In South India negotiations of a searching kind are in progress between the South India United Church and the Anglican Church. In America, in addition to all the work relating to the proposed World Conference on Faith and Order, the preparations for which are proceeding apace, the Protestant Episcopal Church has shown a remarkable readiness for new openings in its dealings with the members of many European Churches who have come to live in the United States. I have appreciated highly the encouraging news which reaches me from Australia of Conferences at Sydney and at Cronulla between representatives of our own Communion and of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches. And so I could go on. It seems to me quite clear that in almost every part of the world where the Anglican Communion is found—in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, East Africa, West Africa, and also in Japan, in China, in Egypt, in Palestine, and in many parts of the Continent of Europe—a new spirit of fellowship, a new readiness for understanding and co-operation have been revealed during these eventful years.

5. It will not be forgotten that the Church of Sweden gave a cordial welcome to the Resolutions which the Lambeth Conference adopted with regard to it. In September 1920, the Bishops of Durham and Peterborough, by invitation of the Archbishop of Upsala, took part in the Consecration of two Swedish Bishops in Upsala Cathedral. In April 1922, the Bishops of the Church of Sweden issued a full reply to our Resolutions which was published in the S.P.C.K. magazine *Theology* in July 1922.

6. I pass to the Eastern Orthodox Church and our relations thereto. As you will remember, an important Delegation, officially sent by the Patriarchate of

Constantinople, was welcomed by the Lambeth Conference in 1920 and attended meetings of a special Committee which we appointed for the purpose. On its return to Constantinople the Delegation produced a Report which was officially presented to the Holy Synod and was subsequently printed in *The Christian East* for March 1922. This Report is an important document and raises a number of interesting questions, with some of which our regularly constituted Eastern Churches Committee (appointed at the request of a previous Lambeth Conference) has been invited to deal. Side by side with it a treatise on 'Anglican Ordinations' was published by the late Professor Komnenos,¹ one of the most prominent theologians of the Orthodox Communion, himself a member of the Delegation. In that scholarly treatise the validity of Anglican Orders is clearly upheld. And, as is now well known, in August 1922 the Patriarch and Holy Synod of Constantinople issued an official Declaration on Anglican Ordinations in the form of a letter from the Patriarch Meletios IV to myself. This document states that 'as before the Orthodox Church, the Ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal confession of Bishops, priests and deacons, possess the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic, and Armenian Churches possess, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them which are held indispensable from the orthodox point of view for the recognition of the "Charisma" of the priesthood derived from Apostolic succession.' I communicated the Declaration formally to the Convocation of Canterbury in full Synod last February, and explained fully its meaning and limitations in a speech which was subsequently translated into Greek. The Address in English and Greek is published in pamphlet form. The Constantinople Declaration was shortly afterwards endorsed by the Patriarch of Jerusalem and by the Church of Cyprus.

¹ See *The Christian East*, September 1921.

7. These are not small matters in the contemporary history of the Church of Christ, and you will, I feel sure, pardon me for thus bringing them to your notice or recollection in a consecutive form. A volume is now in the Press under the title *Documents on Christian Unity, 1920-4* (Oxford University Press), which will contain not merely the Reports and papers to which I have here referred, but other information on the subject.

8. In addition to all this there remains the question—a question which has features of paramount importance—of the relation of the Church of England to the Church of Rome. You will agree with me in regarding that subject as separated from other reunion problems, not only by the history of centuries of English life but by present-day claims and utterances. And the plain fact confronts us that in relation to that subject there exist both at home and in the overseas Dominions passions, dormant or awake, which are easily accounted for but which, when once aroused, are difficult to allay. I have myself been repeatedly warned that to touch that subject is unwise. Men urge that 'even if the opportunity be given' it is easier and safer to let it severely alone. That may be true, but you and I are party to the 'Appeal to all Christian People', and I, at least, find it difficult to reconcile that document with an attitude of apathy or sheer timidity as to our touching the Roman Catholic question. Not only are we pledged to the words and spirit of the 'Appeal' itself, but we have before us what was said on the subject by the Committee of the same Lambeth Conference in 1920. We there express our readiness to welcome any friendly discussion between Roman Catholics and Anglicans for which opportunity may be given.¹ I have no right to say that the utterances

¹ The words are as follows: '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

of the Lambeth Conference have influenced Roman Catholic opinion, but I am certain that they have increased our own responsibilities in the matter. I was accordingly glad when I learned two years ago that a private conference or conversation was about to take place at Malines between Cardinal Mercier, the venerated Archbishop of Malines, and a few Anglicans, who were to meet under his roof, with a view to the discussion of outstanding and familiar barriers between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. Though I had no responsibility for this arrangement, nor even any official knowledge of it, I was courteously informed of the proposed visit and was furnished with the names of those who were to take part in the informal discussion.¹ The substance of the conversation which took place was reported to me both by the Cardinal and by my Anglican friends. It necessarily turned in large part upon the position and claims of the Roman See, or in other words, the Primacy of the Pope. A Memorandum upon that and kindred subjects which had been prepared on behalf of the Anglican group was discussed, and the Lambeth Conference 'Appeal to All Christian People' was, I understand, considered paragraph by paragraph. It was suggested that,

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.'

¹ On the Anglican side, Dr. Armitage Robinson, Dean of Wells, Dr. Walter Frere and Lord Halifax; and on the Roman Catholic side, His Eminence the Cardinal, Monsignor van Roey, Vicar General, and the Abbé Portal.

with a view to a second visit, the two English Archbishops might informally nominate delegates and might suggest the outline of discussion to be followed. I did not see my way to doing this, but in the correspondence which ensued I expressed my readiness to have official cognizance of the arrangements, provided that a corresponding cognizance were given by the Vatican. Satisfied, after correspondence, with regard to that point, I gave what was described as friendly cognizance to a second visit of the Anglican group to Malines in March 1923. They again received the kindly hospitality which has been courteously given and gratefully welcomed. The conversation on that occasion turned in part on certain large administrative problems which might arise, if and when a measure of agreement had been reached on the great doctrinal and historical questions sundering the two Churches.

It was agreed that a third Conference should take place. A wish was expressed on both sides that the number of participants should be enlarged, and I took the responsibility of definitely inviting Dr. Charles Gore, late Bishop of Oxford, and Dr. Kidd, Warden of Keble College, Oxford (both of whom had given special attention to the Roman question), to join the Anglican group. This increased my responsibility in the matter, and I found myself in concurrence with His Eminence the Cardinal, as well as with the members of the original group, in pressing the point that prior to any discussion upon the possible administrative questions which might arise, attention should be concentrated upon the great doctrinal and historical issues at stake between the two Churches. Certain memoranda were prepared and circulated,¹ and I had the advantage of personally conferring

¹ To prevent misunderstanding I ought perhaps to explain that Lord Halifax's second pamphlet, entitled *Further Considerations on Behalf of Reunion*, was published independently, to express his personal view on certain points relating to the origin and growth of the Papacy. That view, as their writings show, is not shared by his Anglican companions at Malines.

at Lambeth with the five Anglicans who were to take part in the third Conference, together with a few friends and counsellors of my own whom I had invited to meet them. I have always considered it important that our representatives at Conferences which take place, whether with Free Churchmen, or Orthodox, or Roman Catholics, should remember that, while each individual remains free to express his own opinions, what is in question is not what any individual may think but what the great Anglican body has in the past maintained or is likely to maintain in the future. I found, as I anticipated, that our visitors to Malines were not likely to forget what the historical Anglican position and claims have been in the past, as set forward for example by the great theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—a position which we have no thought of changing or weakening to-day. It seemed to me to be fair to the Roman Catholic members of the Malines Conference, now augmented by the addition of Monsignor Batiffol and the Abbé Hemmer, that the firmness and coherence, as we believe, of our Anglican doctrine and system should be unmistakably set forward.

Thus arranged, the third Conference was held at Malines a few weeks ago, under the same kindly hospitality as before. There has not yet been time to weigh adequately the record of the conversations which took place, still less the unsolved differences which they exhibit, but I may say at once that, as was inevitable, the discussions are still in a quite elementary stage, and that no estimate, so far as I judge, can yet be formed as to their ultimate value. Needless to say, there has been no attempt to initiate what may be called 'negotiations' of any sort. The Anglicans who have, with my full encouragement, taken part, are in no sense delegates or representatives of the Church as a whole. I had neither the will nor the right to give them that character. This is well understood on both sides. They have sought merely

to effect some re-statement of controverted questions, and some elucidation of perplexities. And to me it seems indubitable that good must in the Providence of God ensue from the mere fact that men possessing such peculiar qualifications for the task should, in an atmosphere of goodwill on either side, have held quiet and unrestrained converse with a group of Roman Catholic theologians similarly equipped. No further plans are yet prepared, but it is impossible, I think, to doubt that further conversations must follow from the careful talks already held. At the least we have endeavoured in this direction, as in others, to give effect to the formal recommendation of the Lambeth Conference that we should 'invite the authorities of other Churches to confer with [us] concerning the possibility of taking definite steps to co-operate in a common endeavour . . . to restore the unity of the Church of Christ'.

I have stated all this somewhat fully, though there is, of course, a great deal more which might be said. Indeed, I hope myself before long to have an opportunity in Convocation¹ or elsewhere of speaking further upon the subject. From the nature of the case the proceedings have of necessity been private. To attempt them publicly would have been obviously futile. For what has been done I am bound to accept full personal responsibility. I have not thought it right, or indeed, practicable, to involve others in that responsibility, though I have confidentially informed all our Diocesan Bishops, and especially the Archbishop of York, of every step that has been taken. The difficulties are immense. You know them as clearly as I do. They may prove to be, for some time to come, insuperable. Paul may plant and Apollos water, it is God who giveth the increase.

¹ The Archbishop of Canterbury made a full statement in the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation on February 6, 1924 (see *Chronicle of Convocation* February 1924). [*Editor.*]

9. In this letter, my dear Brother, I have recounted facts and endeavours with some of which you are, I am glad to know, familiar. With all that is astir in the world to-day, there may be some—you I am sure are not among them—who think that we are devoting too much time and effort to questions of reunion within the Church of Christ.

To us it seems certain that upon the Church of Christ must rest a chief responsibility for every forward step that can be taken towards the healing and the bettering of a distracted world. If the Church is to fulfil such a function in the world, its effort is infinitely weakened so long as it is obliged to go forward in scattered and independent detachments, and not as one body. It is in simple and whole-hearted reliance upon the guidance of God the Holy Spirit that we are emboldened to nourish hope and to shape resolve. The vision which our Lord, as we believe, has set before us points the road to reunion. The road may not be short, but we believe it will be sure.

I remain, as always,

My dear Archbishop,

Your faithful brother and servant in our Lord Jesus Christ,

RANDALL CANTUAR:

XXI. THE CONVERSATIONS AT MALINES

90. *Letter from Cardinal Mercier to his Clergy*

LES « CONVERSATIONS DE MALINES »

Lettre de S. E. le Card. D. J. MERCIER à son Clergé.

Malines, le 18 janvier 1924
Fête de la Chaire de saint Pierre à Rome

CHERS CONFRÈRES ET DÉVOUÉS COLLABORATEURS,

Voilà deux années, et davantage, que je suis en relations intimes avec quelques personnalités du monde Anglican auxquelles je porte une estime profonde et une affection sincère. Nous nous sommes rencontrés plusieurs fois ; nous avons échangé avec elles des correspondances au sujet de ce que nous avons le plus ardemment à cœur, les intérêts de l'Église Catholique notre Mère.

Il ne nous serait pas venu à la pensée de vous mettre au courant de ces relations, pour la raison fort simple que leur objet est, de sa nature, confidentiel et que nous nous sommes engagés, au surplus, de part et d'autre, à n'en rien livrer au public sans un accord préalable.

Cet accord a été gardé. L'Archevêque de Cantorbéry n'a rien révélé de ce qui forma le thème de nos conversations et de leurs conclusions, mais il a jugé l'heure venue pour lui de fixer ses coreligionnaires sur l'attitude qu'il avait prise à l'égard de nos conférences. C'était, de sa part, un acte de loyauté auquel nous accordâmes, d'ailleurs, notre plein acquiescement. C'était aussi un acte de courage, car, étant donné l'état d'esprit, déclaré ou sourd, très répandu encore dans les milieux Anglais non catholiques, et que l'on désigne souvent d'un mot, « l'anti-papisme », il était aisé de prévoir qu'un témoignage de

déférence, ne fût-il qu'implicite et indirect, à un évêque, à un Cardinal de l'Église de Rome, attirerait à son auteur autre chose que des sympathies et des compliments.

Dans une Lettre datée de Noël 1923, adressée aux archevêques et aux métropolitains de la communion anglicane, le Dr. Randall Davidson, archevêque de Cantorbéry, fait allusion aux « Conversations de Malines » et déclare que, sans y avoir officiellement engagé son autorité, il ne les a pas ignorées, y a pris intérêt, et en espère des résultats heureux.

Les milieux protestants et un certain nombre de catholiques s'épurent fort de cette révélation. Pendant plusieurs semaines, les journaux et les revues y ont vu un thème à vives controverses, dont l'écho a passé la Manche ; le désir du public d'avoir chaque matin des nouvelles à sensations, l'ardeur des journalistes à lui en fournir qui allassent crescendo, créèrent autour de nos paisibles réunions de Malines une atmosphère d'agitation factice, à laquelle il est de mon devoir de les soustraire.

Je vous dirai les faits, à l'effet de les rétablir dans la simplicité de leur vérité.

Je vous en fournirai les raisons déterminantes.

Et, puisque l'occasion heureuse m'en est offerte, j'essaierai d'en tirer, Chers Confrères, pour vous et pour nous un enseignement qui fait loi dans le ministère pastoral.

I

Les Faits.

Les autorités religieuses, les hommes d'ordre attentifs à l'évolution des idées et des événements, s'effraient de la déchristianisation des masses et de la rapidité avec laquelle la disparition de la Foi au surnaturel mène à la négation de toute religion. Le phénomène est général, mais il est plus grave, plus saillant chez les nations protestantes qu'en pays catholiques.

Déjà Newman, en 1877, l'écrivait : « J'ai toujours « pensé, disait-il, que nous sommes arrivés à une époque « où l'infidélité se répand partout. En fait, pendant ces « dernières années, les eaux se sont élevées comme un « déluge. J'entrevois, pour après ma mort, le moment « où seuls les sommets des montagnes apparaîtront comme « des îles dans le désert des eaux. » Et il ajoutait : « Je « parle surtout du monde protestant. »¹

Oui, « surtout dans le monde protestant », parce que, là, les divergences doctrinales des « confessions » ou « dénominations » qui s'y multiplient privent les consciences religieuses du spectacle lumineux et réconfortant de l'unité dans la Foi. La désagrégation de la communion protestante conduit au libéralisme en matière religieuse, c'est-à-dire, à cette sorte de croyance vague que toutes les religions représentent des opinions libres qui se valent, pour la raison qu'aucune d'elles ne peut invoquer à son profit les preuves d'une Révélation positive et divine ; alors, l'indifférentisme religieux lui-même conduit inévitablement à l'irréligion, au sectarisme antireligieux.

Les Protestants clairvoyants virent se réaliser les prédictions de Newman. Ceux d'entre eux qui ont gardé la Foi à la divinité du Christ et de son Église, ceux qui prient pour eux-mêmes et pour les âmes dont ils ont la charge, discernent le péril, se sentent le devoir de s'appliquer à le conjurer. Eux aussi croient à la parole des Actes des Apôtres : « Il n'y a de salut que dans le Christ, » « *Non est in alio aliquo salus.* »²

C'est un groupe de ces hommes de Foi, une élite intellectuelle et morale, que la divine Providence a conduite vers nous et que nous eûmes la consolation d'accueillir.

Nos deux premiers visiteurs furent Lord Halifax, que toute l'Angleterre, sans distinction de religion, ni de parti,

¹ Wilfrid Ward, *The Life of Newman*, ii, p. 416.

² Act. Ap. IV, 12.

vénère et affectionne, et M. l'Abbé Portal, fils de saint Vincent de Paul, prêtre de la Mission, ancien Supérieur de Grand Séminaire, et qui fut intimement mêlé, sous Léon XIII, à la question de la validité des Ordinations anglicanes ; il exerce aujourd'hui auprès de la jeunesse universitaire de Paris un apostolat de premier plan.

Ils nous procurèrent, en octobre 1921, l'occasion de faire personnellement leur connaissance et nous revinrent les 6, 7 et 8 décembre de la même année, accompagnés de deux Anglicans de marque, le Dr. Armitage Robinson, doyen de Wells, ami intime de l'Archevêque de Cantorbéry, et le Dr. Frere, supérieur de la communauté religieuse des Résurrectionnistes, devenu depuis lors évêque de Truro, l'un et l'autre auteurs de publications hautement appréciées sur des sujets scripturaires et d'ancienne littérature chrétienne.

Pour leur donner accueil, nous invitâmes à se joindre à nous M. l'Abbé Portal, et notre savant et dévoué Vicaire Général, Mgr Van Roey, Maître en théologie de l'Université de Louvain.

Il fut, dès l'abord, entendu que l'objet et les résultats éventuels de nos entretiens resteraient privés, jusqu'au jour où, de commun accord, nous jugerions utile et opportun d'en publier les conclusions.

Les deux groupes se retrouvèrent à Malines en mars 1923.

En novembre de la même année, eut lieu une troisième réunion à laquelle prirent part, cette fois, outre le doyen Robinson et le Dr. Frere, le célèbre Dr. Charles Gore, ancien évêque d'Oxford, sorti du ministère actif pour se vouer exclusivement à ses travaux de science religieuse, et le Dr. Kidd, Préfet du Keble College, un des hommes les plus considérés d'Oxford.

Mgr Batiffol, chanoine de Notre-Dame de Paris, si universellement estimé pour ses travaux sur les origines chrétiennes, et M. l'Abbé Hemmer, curé de Saint-Mandé,

qui professa jadis l'histoire à l'Institut Catholique de Paris, avaient bien voulu venir se joindre à nous et nous apporter leur précieux concours.

Tels étaient nos hôtes : voici quel fut le caractère de nos réunions.

Celles-ci, de la première à la dernière, furent *privées* : c'étaient des *conversations* dans un salon privé.

Ce n'était donc pas la rencontre d'autorités ecclésiastiques envoyant l'une vers l'autre leurs délégués officiels.

Cette déclaration que nous émettons ici, l'archevêque de Cantorbéry l'a formulée nettement dans son message à ses Métropolitains ; on semble n'avoir pas voulu le remarquer. Il savait, certes, ses amis en relation à Malines avec des membres du clergé catholique ; il suivait avec un sympathique intérêt le développement de nos entretiens, mais, dès l'abord, il avait tenu à affirmer, comme nous-même d'ailleurs, que nous n'engagions d'aucune façon, ni les communautés auxquelles nous appartenons, ni l'autorité que, dans une certaine mesure, nous représentions.

Nos échanges d'idées ne furent donc pas des « négociations ». Pour négocier, il faut être porteur d'un mandat et, ni de part ni d'autre, nous n'avions de mandat. Aussi bien, en ce qui nous concerne, n'en avions-nous pas sollicité : il nous suffisait de savoir que nous marchions d'accord avec l'Autorité suprême, bénis et encouragés par Elle.

Nous nous mîmes à l'œuvre, animés d'un même désir de mutuelle compréhension et d'aide fraternelle.

Évidemment, sur plusieurs questions fondamentales le désaccord des deux groupes était notoire ; de part et d'autre, on en avait conscience. Mais, nous nous disions que, si la vérité a ses droits, la charité a ses devoirs ; nous pensions que, peut-être, en parlant à cœur ouvert et avec la persuasion intime que, dans un vaste conflit

historique, qui a duré des siècles, tous les torts ne sont pas d'un seul côté ; en précisant les termes de certaines questions en litige, nous ferions tomber des préventions, des méfiances, dissiperions des équivoques, aplanirions les voies au bout desquelles une âme loyale, aidée de la grâce, découvrirait s'il pouvait plaire à Dieu, ou retrouverait la vérité.

Le fait est qu'à l'heure de clôture de chacune de nos trois réunions les membres se sentaient plus étroitement liés, plus confiants les uns dans les autres, qu'à leur prise de contact. Nos hôtes nous l'ont dit ; nous l'ont écrit ; nous leur avons tenu le même langage ; je suis heureux de le répéter ici.

Cependant, l'on pense bien que, lorsque surgirent des questions essentielles—telle la Primauté du Pape définie par le Concile du Vatican, et qui fut la première et la dernière à l'ordre du jour—ni mes amis ni moi n'eûmes, un instant, la pensée de sacrifier à un désir insensé d'union à tout prix un seul article du Credo catholique, apostolique et romain.

Nos rencontres furent donc des conversations privées ; elles n'engageaient que notre responsabilité personnelle ; elles eurent un caractère amical ; j'ajoute qu'elles furent instructives et édifiantes.

Aucun livre ne vaut un commerce oral. La conversation est révélatrice de choses intimes qui ne passent pas dans la lettre imprimée.

Les hommes sont faits pour s'aimer les uns les autres ; il n'est pas rare que des cœurs mutuellement étrangers qui auraient pu, à distance, se croire ennemis, goûtent, à se comprendre, un charme pénétrant qu'ils n'auraient pas soupçonné.

Nos compagnons, à leur départ, avaient l'âme dilatée.

C'est peut-être la première fois, depuis quatre cents ans, disait l'un d'eux, que des hommes d'études, protestants et

catholiques, aient pu s'entretenir, avec une franchise entière, pendant des heures et des heures, sur les sujets les plus graves qui intellectuellement les divisent, sans qu'un instant la cordialité de leurs rapports en ait été troublée, ni leur confiance dans l'avenir déconcertée.

Assurément, le rapprochement des cœurs n'est pas l'unité dans la Foi, mais il y dispose.

Des hommes, surtout des groupements d'hommes qui ont vécu longtemps étrangers les uns aux autres, dans une atmosphère chargée de méfiances sinon d'animosités, ancrées dans les profondeurs des consciences par une tradition quatre fois séculaire, sont mal préparés à se rendre aux argumentations, si serrées soient-elles, que veulent leur imposer leurs contradicteurs.

Avant de définir la justification chrétienne, le Concile de Trente ne dit-il pas que, pour s'y disposer, il faut préparer les cœurs à écouter la parole de Dieu : « *Præparate corda vestra Domino* » ? ¹

Si la Providence divine a conduit vers nous, plutôt que vers d'autres plus directement mêlés à des controverses religieuses, certains chrétiens dissidents, ne serait-ce pas parce que, à raison même de notre isolement, il nous était possible d'accomplir, dans une atmosphère plus sereine, une tâche toute préliminaire à des négociations et à des déterminations qui devraient éventuellement se poursuivre et se conclure ailleurs ?

Au milieu même du bruit qui se faisait autour de la Lettre de l'Archevêque à ses Métropolitains, le membre de nos réunions auquel je faisais allusion à l'instant m'écrivait : « Il serait malaisé à qui n'habite pas l'Angleterre de mesurer l'importance que prendra dans l'opinion publique le résultat qui vient d'être acquis. Même si le succès immédiat est peu considérable, je crois qu'il marquera pour beaucoup un point de départ vers de nouveaux

¹ I Regum, vii. 3.

progrès et que nous aurons les meilleures raisons d'en rendre grâces à Dieu. »¹

Au surplus, à l'issue de chacune de nos conférences nous primes congé les uns des autres en nous promettant de prier, de faire prier nos ouailles pour le succès de la cause sainte qui nous avait réunis.

Il me souvient que le Dr. Kidd, au début de notre dernier entretien, me disait, et j'espère qu'il ne trouvera pas indiscret que je le redise : « J'ai prié avec mes élèves avant de quitter Oxford et je sais qu'ils invoquent en ce moment l'Esprit Saint pour le succès de nos travaux. »

Quant à nous, mes chers Confrères, nous savons que, dans son Encyclique « *Provida Matris* » du 5 mai 1895, le Pape Léon XIII, de sainte mémoire, demanda aux catholiques du monde entier des prières spéciales à l'Esprit Saint, « pour la réconciliation, qu'il espérait avec une « ferme confiance, de nos frères séparés. » Nous savons que, reprenant avec plus d'ampleur encore, dans son Encyclique « *Divinum illud munus* » du 9 mai 1897, la même pensée, il prescrivait une neuvaine de prières, à laquelle vous restez fidèles chaque année, de l'Ascension à la Pentecôte, afin de hâter la réalisation bénie de l'unité chrétienne, « *ad maturandum christianæ unitatis bonum.* »

Le Pape Benoît XV, n'a-t-il pas encouragé une octave de prières, du 18 janvier, fête de la chaire de Saint Pierre, au 25 janvier, fête de la conversion de saint Paul, pour obtenir le retour de nos frères séparés à l'unité de l'Église ?

Et notre Père bien-aimé, le Pape Pie XI, ne nous révèle-t-il pas les sentiments de charité et de piété de sa grande âme lorsque, dans son Encyclique si paternelle

¹ Avec la permission de l'auteur nous citons l'original : « It is hard for any one outside England to understand how serious the step will appear in the public mind, both among those who care deeply and among those who do not. Even if we get but little further at present, I believe that this will mean a new outlook for very many, and that we shall have good reason for true gratitude to God . . . ,

« *Ecclesiam Dei*, » Il invite Latins et Orientaux à se mieux comprendre et prie ceux-ci de ne pas rendre l'Église Romaine responsable des préjugés, des torts personnels de ceux-là ; lorsque aux uns et aux autres Il demande de prier, afin que se réalise l'accord de tous les peuples dans l'unité œcuménique, « *hæc populorum omnium in œcumenica unitate consensio* » ?

Tel est donc l'exposé rapide des faits.

Voici le pourquoi de nos « conversations ».

II

Pourquoi ces conversations ?

Pourquoi ? Tout d'abord, parce que je n'ai pas le droit de me dérober à une occasion qui vient à moi de faire un acte de charité fraternelle et d'hospitalité chrétienne.

Pour rien au monde, je ne voudrais autoriser un de nos frères séparés à dire qu'il a frappé de confiance à la porte d'un évêque catholique romain et que cet évêque catholique romain a refusé de lui ouvrir.

Une grande nation fut, pendant plus de huit siècles, notre sœur aimée ; elle donna à l'Église une phalange de saints que nous honorons encore aujourd'hui dans notre liturgie ; elle a gardé au sein d'un vaste empire des ressources étonnantes de vitalité chrétienne, elle exerce un rayonnement immense sur d'innombrables missions, mais elle porte au flanc une blessure ; nous, catholiques, maintenus par la grâce de Dieu dans la vérité intégrale, nous nous lamentons sur le déchirement criminel qui l'arracha, il y a quatre siècles, à l'Église notre Mère ; et, ce sont des catholiques qui voudraient qu'à l'exemple du Lévitte et du Prêtre de la Loi ancienne réprouvés par notre divin Sauveur dans la parabole du Samaritain un évêque catholique passât à côté de ce grand blessé, dans une indifférence superbe, refusât de verser une goutte d'huile

dans sa plaie béante, de la bander, et de s'essayer à amener l'infirme à l'hôtel-Dieu où l'appelle la divine Miséricorde !

Je me serais jugé coupable si j'avais commis cette lâcheté.

Oh ! je le sais, ceux qui nous jugent de travers ne voudront pas méconnaître nos intentions charitables, mais ils estiment notre intervention inopportune et inefficace.

Inopportune, parce qu'il vaut mieux, selon eux, laisser les églises séparées aller à une décomposition complète, s'accuser plus fort le contraste entre l'erreur et la vérité : arrivé aux extrêmes, le mal épouvantera, et ce sera l'heure du triomphe de la vérité.

Inefficace, parce que, semble-t-il, je n'emploie pas la bonne méthode d'apostolat, celle des conversions individuelles.

Pesons, un instant, ces deux griefs.

Je ne trouve nulle part préconisée ni approuvée dans l'Évangile la politique du pire. J'y lis, au contraire, qu'il ne faut pas étouffer la mèche qui fume encore.

Que des protestants croyants tombent dans le libéralisme en matière religieuse, que ses victimes deviennent indifférentes à toute religion positive, aboutissent à l'irreligion, aillent grossir les rangs de l'athéisme, et, bientôt après, ceux de l'anarchie : c'est un mal, un grand mal.

Des chrétiens sincères se sentent impuissants—ne le sommes-nous pas nous-mêmes dans une moindre mesure ? —à enrayer ce mal, font appel à notre aide secourable, nous invitent tout au moins à nous concerter avec eux pour enrayer l'irreligion, et il se trouverait des esprits outranciers pour nous l'interdire !

Voilà donc, déjà, un premier service positif à rendre à nos frères séparés, une première raison de les accueillir à cœur ouvert.

Soit, dira-t-on peut-être, mais là n'était pas votre objectif principal : il s'agissait, avant tout, d'exercer une

action directe sur des croyants, membres de « la Haute-Église », afin de les ramener à l'Église de Rome.

L'objectif principal ! Qu'en savez-vous ? Nous n'avons jamais sérié, par ordre d'importance, les motifs inspirateurs de notre conduite.

Nous avons considéré une situation d'ensemble où nous apparaissaient des âmes, soucieuses à la fois d'elles-mêmes et de leur influence sociale. Nous avons eu la confiance de penser que nous pouvions rendre un service d'aide spirituelle à nos frères et trouvé là une seconde raison de converser avec eux.

Mais vous jugez que nous nous y prenons mal pour dénouer cette situation : notre méthode de travail est, selon vous, maladroite ; l'expérience vous a appris qu'il faut renoncer à agir sur les collectivites ; il faut ne viser que les individus.

De quel droit limitez-vous l'action de la divine Miséricorde ? Agissez, tant que vous le pouvez, sur les individus ; éclairez, de votre mieux, chacune des âmes que Dieu met sur votre chemin, priez pour elle, dévouez-vous à elle : parfait ; nul ne pourrait songer à vous en blâmer.

Mais, qu'est-ce qui vous autorise à écarter les collectivités ? C'est votre exclusivisme qui est condamnable.

Laissez-moi rafraîchir vos souvenirs. Écoutez la grande voix de Léon XIII, qui, le 14 avril 1895, dans sa Lettre Apostolique « *Amantissimæ Voluntatis* », s'adressait, non aux individus, mais à la masse du peuple anglais, « *ad Anglos* ». Relisez cette Encyclique, elle a pour destinataire la nation appelée par le Pape « *gens Anglorum illustris* » ; et quand, au moment de conclure, le saint Pontife pressent les objections que des pessimistes opposeront à son optimisme, il écrit : « Des difficultés, il y en a, oui, mais elles « ne sont pas de nature à ralentir le moins du monde notre « charité apostolique, ni à décourager vos volontés. » « *Difficultates, si quæ sunt, non sunt tamen ejusmodi ut*

« aut caritatem nostram Apostolicam omnino iis retardari,
 « aut voluntatem vestram deterreri oporteat ». « Sans
 « doute, les révolutions et une séparation plusieurs fois
 « séculaire ont enraciné des dissentiments dans les cœurs :
 « mais, est-ce une raison de renoncer à tout espoir de
 « réconciliation et de paix ? » « Esto, quod rerum con-
 « versionibus ac diuturnitate ipsa dissidium convaluerit :
 « num idcirco reconciliationis pacisque remedia respuat
 « omnia ? » « Nullement, s'il plaît à Dieu. » ' « Nequaquam
 « ita, si Deo placet. »

« Pour évaluer les résultats que peut promettre l'avenir,
 « il ne faut pas se baser seulement sur des calculs humains,
 « il faut surtout tenir compte de la puissance et de la
 « miséricorde de Dieu. » « Sunt eventus rerum non pro-
 « visione humana tantummodo sed maxime virtute
 « pietateque divina metiendi. »

« Lorsque nous sommes aux prises avec une œuvre vaste
 « et laborieuse, » — c'est toujours le Pape qui parle—
 « ayons une intention droite et le cœur généreux ; et
 « Dieu alors sera avec nous ; c'est à triompher des
 « obstacles que se révèle avec le plus d'éclat la beauté de
 « l'action de la divine Providence. » « In rebus enim
 « magnis atque arduis, si modo sint sincero et bono animo
 « susceptæ, adest homini Deus, cujus Providentia ab ipsis
 « inceptorum difficultatibus capit quo magnificentius
 « eluceat. »

Une année et demie plus tard, en septembre 1896, le Pape se voit obligé d'infliger aux Anglicans une déception amère : il proclame l'invalidité de leurs ordinations. Va-t-il abandonner ses larges espoirs et ne préconiser plus que la propagande d'individu à individu ? Au contraire, il conclut sa Lettre Apostolique « *Apostolicæ curæ* » par un appel direct aux ministres qu'il a eu la douleur de peiner et il conjure les individus et la masse de s'inspirer ensuite de l'exemple de leur conversion.

« Nous ne cesserons pas, dit-il, de travailler, autant que
« nous le pourrons, à leur réconciliation avec l'Église ; les
« individus et les groupes trouveront alors en eux, c'est
« notre ardent désir, de puissants exemples à imiter. »
« Nos quidem, quantum omni ope licuerit, eorum (re-
« ligionis ministrorum) cum Ecclesia reconciliationem
« fovere non desistemus ; ex qua *singuli* et *ordines*, id
« quod vehementer cupimus, multum capere possunt ad
« imitandum. »

C'est que, mes chers Confrères, aujourd'hui encore, en dépit de toutes les déclamations emphatiques sur les progrès intellectuels des masses populaires, sur l'indépendance de leur pensée et la souveraineté de leurs initiatives, le peuple ne précède pas, il suit, il ne commande pas, il obéit. Même en démocratie, le régime social reste oligarchique. Des tribuns démagogues, d'une part, des élites, d'autre part, se disputent l'hégémonie des foules, les premiers pour prêcher la violence et soulever les révolutions, les secondes, pour sauvegarder l'ordre et la discipline.

Si donc il est dans le plan de la divine Providence que nos frères séparés de nous depuis Luther, Henri VIII et la reine Élisabeth, rentrent un jour dans le giron de l'Église, il appartient aux élites d'ouvrir les voies à ce mouvement de retour. Que des autorités morales respectées de tous entrent dans une conception plus sereine des relations voulues par le Christ entre les fidèles, l'épiscopat et la Papauté, un grand pas sera fait dans le sens de l'unité catholique. C'est ce que Léon XIII déclarait si nettement dans sa Lettre « *ad Anglos* » ; c'est ce dont, à la suite de cet illustre Pontife, nous avons essayé de nous pénétrer dans nos « conversations de Malines ».

Si, après cela, vous nous demandez quelles étaient, quelles sont encore aujourd'hui nos espérances, nous ne pouvons que vous répondre, avec Notre Saint-Père le Pape Pie XI, que « l'unité des peuples dans la Foi catho-

lique est, avant tout, l'œuvre de Dieu, » « Hæc populorum « omnium in œcumenica unitate consensio opus in primis est « Dei . . . »¹ La Providence universelle la réalise dans le temps avec force et douceur. « Attingit . . . ad finem fortiter et disponit omnia suaviter, »² mais l'heure des résultats est son secret. Il y emploie les causes secondes ; aux apôtres de son divin Fils Il daigne demander leur collaboration : de personne Il ne réclame, à personne Il ne promet le succès.

III

Un enseignement.

La condition essentielle de la fécondité de l'apostolat.

Cette condition, le Vicaire du Christ nous l'a rappelée dans cet avertissement : « Les grands événements religieux de l'histoire ne se peuvent évaluer par des calculs humains. »

Dans une œuvre dont le résultat est le salut des âmes, le facteur essentiel n'est ni la sagesse humaine, ni la sagacité des tacticiens, c'est la bonne simplicité évangélique, la foi à la divine miséricorde, à la toute-puissance de la grâce qui suppléera, au besoin, à l'insuffisance des procédés.

Cette foi ardente est à l'origine, au milieu, au terme de tout effort d'apostolat.

Seule, elle est capable de soutenir la constance du missionnaire ; seule elle lui assurera, quoi qu'il advienne, sa récompense.

Dans le domaine surnaturel, « ce n'est », dit saint Paul, « ni de vouloir, ni de courir qui importe, c'est de se fier « à la miséricorde de Dieu. » « Neque volentis, neque « currentis, sed miserentis est Dei. »³

« Vous aurez beau planter, » dit-il encore, « arroser vos « plantations, un seul a le pouvoir de donner aux organismes vivants la croissance, c'est Dieu. » « Neque qui

¹ Encycl. *Ecclesiam Dei*.

² Sap. viii. 1.

³ Rom. ix. 16.

« plantat est aliquid, neque qui rigat, sed qui incrementum dat, Deus. »¹

Vous vous impatientez, le succès est lent à venir, vos peines vous semblent perdues. Soyez sur vos gardes ; la nature et ses empressements vous égarent : un effort de charité n'est jamais perdu. Mais « les fruits de salut réclament une longue patience » : « fructum afferatis in patientia. »²

Ne voyez-vous pas comment la Providence conduit les causes secondes ? Dans l'ordre de la nature, le laboureur jette les graines dans ses sillons laborieusement creusés, puis il laisse passer les frimas de l'hiver, il attend le soleil du printemps, les chaleurs de l'été, et ce n'est qu'après cette longue attente, faite d'alternances de craintes et d'espoirs, qu'il a enfin la joie de récolter et d'enranger ses moissons.

Nous aussi, moissonneurs d'âmes, le Christ nous en a prévenus, nous avons à semer à la sueur de notre front, et, le plus souvent, dans les larmes, avant que sonne l'heure de la moisson ; et quand sonnera cette heure bénie un autre vraisemblablement aura pris notre place. « Alius est « qui seminat, et alius est qui metit. »³ « Qui seminant in « lacrymis, in exultatione metent. Euntes ibant et flebant « mittentes semina sua. Venientes autem venient cum « exultatione, portantes manipulos suos. »⁴

Conclusion.

Mes bien chers Confrères, je conclus. Si j'ai pris aujourd'hui la parole pour vous mettre au courant d'un effort qui, dans ma pensée, devait rester secret, c'est parce que je me suis aperçu que plusieurs de nos confrères d'Outre-Manche, égarés par des informations fantaisistes et des commentaires hasardés de la presse, interprétaient

¹ 1 Cor. iii. 7.

² Luc. viii. 15. Cfr. 2 Cor. vi. 4.

³ Joan. iv. 38.

⁴ Ps. cxxv. 5-6.

erronément mon action et s'en offensaient ; c'est aussi parce que, dénaturée à vos yeux, cette action eût pu, non seulement me priver d'un pieux concours que j'attends de vous en ceci comme en tout ce qu'il m'est donné d'entreprendre à la gloire de notre Dieu, mais fausser même la conception spirituellement désintéressée que vous devez vous faire de l'apostolat.

J'espère avoir réussi à dissiper le léger nuage de poussière qui, un instant, s'est interposé entre nos amis d'Angleterre et nous-mêmes.

J'espère aussi avoir avivé vos sympathies pour la cause sainte de l'unité de l'Église, en réponse au vœu suprême du Pasteur des pasteurs, *le* Pasteur par excellence, Notre Seigneur Jésus : « Ut omnes unum sint » « Que tous ne fassent qu'un ! »

« Je suis *le* bon Pasteur¹ », dit-Il ; « je connais (d'une connaissance toute chargée d'amour) les brebis qui sont miennes, et celles qui sont miennes me connaissent, de même que mon Père me connaît (et m'aime) et que je connais (et que j'aime) mon Père. Aussi donné-je ma vie pour le troupeau (confié à mes soins). Ego sum Pastor bonus : et cognosco oves meas et cognoscunt me meæ, sicut novit me Pater et ego agnosco Patrem. »

Mais aussitôt, Il ajoute : « Puis, j'ai d'autres brebis encore. » — Il ne dit pas : « Je les aurai, » ni « Je les voudrais avoir, » Il dit : « Je les ai, elles sont à moi, *habeo* » ; — oui, « J'ai d'autres brebis encore qui, présentement, ne font pas partie de mon bercail ; il faut me les amener, et alors, quand vous me les aurez amenées, proche de moi, et qu'elles entendront ma voix, il n'y aura plus qu'un seul bercail et un unique Pasteur. » « Et alias oves habeo, quæ non sunt ex hoc ovili : et illas oportet me adducere, et vocem meam audient, et fiet unum ovile et unus pastor. »²

¹ Ποιμήν ὁ καλός.

² Joan. x. 14-16.

Vous l'avez entendue, mes chers Confrères, la parole du Maître : « Oportet », « il faut me les amener. »

Allez donc dans les broussailles, le long des sentiers rocailleux, sous le soleil brûlant du désert, allez partout où il y a des brebis à découvrir et à sauver.

Ne vous préoccupez pas du succès ; Dieu ne l'exige pas de vous ; ce qu'Il réclame de vous, dit saint Bernard, c'est le soin des malades, Il se réserve de les guérir : « Curam exigeris, non curationem. »¹

A travers tout l'exercice de votre ministère pastoral, priez, peinez, donnez, dépensez-vous ; commencez, tenez bon, persévérez ; fidèles toujours au mot de saint Bernard, ne perdez jamais confiance ; à vous le travail, à Dieu le succès, « Noli diffidere, curam exigeris, non curationem. »

Votre tout dévoué in X^o,

† D. J. CARD. MERCIER, *Archev. de Malines.*

¹ *De Consideratione*, Lib. iv, Cap. ii.

I. THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER

[The World Conference was held at Lausanne, August 3-21, 1927. About 500 delegates were present and nearly all the Christian Communion, except the Roman Catholic Church, were represented. The President was the Rt. Rev. C. H. Brent, D.D.; the Deputy-Chairman, the Rev. A. E. Garvie, D.D.; and the General Secretary, Mr. R. W. Brown. At the close of the Conference a Continuation Committee was appointed which met at Prague in 1928, and at Maloja in 1929. The Documents which follow are: (1) The Reports of the Conference as a whole, which were ordered to be sent to all the Churches represented for their consideration and report to the Continuation Committee which would later 'consider what steps need to be taken for another Conference'; (2) An independent Declaration made by the representatives of the Eastern Orthodox Church; (3) A Resolution adopted by the Continuation Committee in 1929.]

91. *Preamble*

UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE FULL CONFERENCE
AUGUST 20, 1927

WE, representatives of many Christian Communion throughout the world, united in the common confession of faith in Jesus Christ the Son of God, our Lord and Saviour, believing that the Spirit of God is with us, are assembled to consider the things wherein we agree and the things wherein we differ. We now receive the following series of reports as containing subject matter for the consideration of our respective Churches in their common search for unity.

This is a Conference summoned to consider matters of Faith and Order. It is emphatically *not* attempting to define the conditions of future reunion. Its object is to register the apparent level of fundamental agreements within the Conference and the grave points of disagreements remaining; also to suggest certain lines of thought which may in the future tend to a fuller measure of agreement.

Each subject on the agenda was first discussed in plenary session. It was then committed to one of the sections, of more than one hundred members each, into which the whole Conference was divided. The report, after full discussion in subsections, was finally drawn up and adopted unanimously or by a large majority vote by the section to which it had been committed. It was twice presented for further discussion to a plenary session of the Conference when it was referred to the Churches in its present form.

Though we recognize the reports to be neither exhaustive nor in all details satisfactory to every member of the Conference, we submit them to the Churches for that deliberate consideration which could not be given in the brief period of our session. We thank God and rejoice over agreements reached; upon our agreements we build. Where the reports record differences, we call upon the Christian world to an earnest reconsideration of the conflicting opinions now held, and a strenuous endeavour to reach the truth as it is in God's mind, which should be the foundation of the Church's unity.

92. The Call to Unity

UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE FULL CONFERENCE

AUGUST 20, 1927

God wills unity. Our presence in this Conference bears testimony to our desire to bend our wills to His. However we may justify the beginnings of disunion, we lament its continuance and henceforth must labour, in penitence and faith, to build up our broken walls.

God's Spirit has been in the midst of us. It was He who called us hither. His presence has been manifest in our worship, our deliberations and our whole fellowship. He has discovered us to one another. He has enlarged our horizons, quickened our understanding, and enlivened our hope. We have dared and God has justified our daring. We can never

be the same again. Our deep thankfulness must find expression in sustained endeavour to share the visions vouchsafed us here with those smaller home groups where our lot is cast.

More than half the world is waiting for the Gospel. At home and abroad sad multitudes are turning away in bewilderment from the Church because of its corporate feebleness. Our missions count that as a necessity which we are inclined to look on as a luxury. Already the mission field is impatiently revolting from the divisions of the Western Church to make bold adventure for unity in its own right. We of the Churches represented in this Conference cannot allow our spiritual children to outpace us. We with them must gird ourselves to the task, the early beginnings of which God has so richly blessed, and labour side by side until our common goal is reached.

Some of us, pioneers in this undertaking, have grown old in our search for unity. It is to youth that we look to lift the torch on high. We men have carried it too much alone through many years. The women henceforth should be accorded their share of responsibility. And so the whole Church will be enabled to do that which no section can hope to perform.

It was God's clear call that gathered us. With faith stimulated by His guidance to us here, we move forward.

93. The Church's Message to the World—the Gospel

REPORT OF SECTION II

RECEIVED BY THE FULL CONFERENCE, *nem. con.*

AUGUST 19, 1927

The message of the Church to the world is and must always remain the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

The Gospel is the joyful message of redemption, both here and hereafter, the gift of God to sinful man in Jesus Christ.

The world was prepared for the coming of Christ through the activities of God's Spirit in all humanity, but especially in His revelation as given in the Old Testament ; and in the fullness of time the eternal Word of God became incarnate, and was made man, Jesus Christ, the son of God and the son of Man, full of grace and truth.

Through His life and teaching, His call to repentance, His proclamation of the coming of the Kingdom of God and of judgement, His suffering and death, His resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of the Father, and by the mission of the Holy Spirit, He has brought to us forgiveness of sins, and has revealed the fullness of the living God, and His boundless love toward us. By the appeal of that love, shown in its completeness on the Cross, He summons us to the new life of faith, self-sacrifice, and devotion to His service and the service of men.

Jesus Christ, as the crucified and the living One, as Saviour and Lord, is also the centre of the world-wide Gospel of the Apostles and the Church. Because He Himself is the Gospel, the Gospel is the message of the Church to the world. It is more than a philosophical theory ; more than a theological system ; more than a programme for material betterment. The Gospel is rather the gift of a new world from God to this old world of sin and death ; still more, it is the victory over sin and death, the revelation of eternal life in Him who has knit together the whole family in heaven and on earth in the communion of saints, united in the fellowship of service, of prayer, and of praise.

The Gospel is the prophetic call to sinful man to turn to God, the joyful tidings of justification and of sanctification to those who believe in Christ. It is the comfort of those who suffer ; to those who are bound, it is the assurance of the glorious liberty of the sons of God. The Gospel brings peace and joy to the heart, and produces in men self-denial, readiness for brotherly service. and compassionate love. It

offers the supreme goal for the aspirations of youth, strength to the toiler, rest to the weary, and the crown of life to the martyr.

The Gospel is the sure source of power for social regeneration. It proclaims the only way by which humanity can escape from those class and race hatreds which devastate society at present into the enjoyment of national well-being and international friendship and peace. It is also a gracious invitation to the non-christian world, East and West, to enter into the joy of the living Lord.

Sympathizing with the anguish of our generation, with its longing for intellectual sincerity, social justice, and spiritual inspiration, the Church in the eternal Gospel meets the needs and fulfils the God-given aspirations of the modern world. Consequently, as in the past, so also in the present, the Gospel is the only way of salvation. Thus, through His Church, the living Christ still says to men 'Come unto me! . . . He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life'.

94. *The Nature of the Church*

REPORT OF SECTION III

RECEIVED BY THE FULL CONFERENCE *nem. con.*

AUGUST 19, 1927

God, who has given us the Gospel for the salvation of the world, has appointed His Church to witness by life and word to its redeeming power. The Church of the Living God is constituted by His own will, not by the will or consent or beliefs of men whether as individuals or as societies, though He uses the will of men as His instrument. Of this Church Jesus Christ is the Head, the Holy Spirit its continuing life.

The Church as the communion of believers in Christ Jesus is, according to the New Testament, the people of the New Covenant; the Body of Christ; and the Temple of God, built

upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone.

The Church is God's chosen instrument by which Christ, through the Holy Spirit, reconciles men to God through faith, bringing their wills into subjection to His sovereignty, sanctifying them through the means of grace, and uniting them in love and service to be His witnesses and fellow-workers in the extension of His rule on earth until His Kingdom come in glory.

As there is but one Christ, and one life in Him, and one Holy Spirit who guides into all truth, so there is and can be but one Church, holy, catholic, and apostolic.

The Church on earth possesses certain characteristics whereby it can be known of men. These have been, since the days of the Apostles, at least the following:

1. The possession and acknowledgement of the Word of God as given in Holy Scripture and interpreted by the Holy Spirit to the Church and to the individual. ^(a)
2. The profession of faith in God as He is incarnate and revealed in Christ.
3. The acceptance of Christ's commission to preach the Gospel to every creature.
4. The observance of the Sacraments.
5. A ministry for the pastoral office, the preaching of the Word, and the administration of the Sacraments.
6. A fellowship in prayer, in worship, in all the means of grace, in the pursuit of holiness, and in the service of man.

As to the extent and manner in which the Church thus described finds expression in the existing Churches, we differ. Our differences chiefly concern:

1. The nature of the Church visible and the Church invisible, their relation to each other, and the number of those who are included in each. ^(b)
2. The significance of our divisions past and present. ^(c)

Whatever our views on these points, we are convinced that it is the will of Christ that the one life of the one body should be manifest to the world. To commend the Gospel to doubting, sinful, and bewildered men, a united witness is necessary. We therefore urge most earnestly that all Christians, in fulfilment of our Saviour's prayer that His disciples may be one, reconsecrate themselves to God, that by the help of His Spirit the body of Christ may be built up, its members united in faith and love, and existing obstacles to the manifestation of their unity in Christ may be removed; that the world may believe that the Father has sent Him.

We join in the prayer that the time may be hastened when in the name of Jesus every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.

NOTES

(a) Some hold that this interpretation is given through the tradition of the Church; others through the immediate witness of the Spirit to the heart and conscience of believers; others through both combined.

(b) For instance

1. Some hold that the invisible Church is wholly in heaven; others include in it all true believers on earth, whether contained in any organization or not.
2. Some hold that the visible expression of the Church was determined by Christ Himself and is therefore unchangeable; others that the one Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit may express itself in varying forms.
3. Some hold that one or other of the existing Churches is the only true Church; others that the Church as we have described it is to be found in some or all of the existing communions taken together.
4. Some, while recognizing other Christian bodies as Churches, are persuaded that in the providence of God and by the teaching of history a particular form of ministry has been shown to be necessary to the best welfare of the Church; others hold that no one form of organization is inherently preferable; still others, that no organization is necessary.

(c) One view is that no division of Christendom has ever come to pass without sin. Another view is that the divisions were the

inevitable outcome of different gifts of the Spirit and different understandings of the truth. Between these, there is the view of those who look back on the divisions of the past with penitence and sorrow coupled with a lively sense of God's mercy, which in spite of and even through these divisions has advanced His cause in the world.

95. *The Church's Common Confession of Faith*

REPORT OF SECTION IV

RECEIVED BY THE FULL CONFERENCE, *nem. con.*

AUGUST 19, 1927

We members of the Conference on Faith and Order, coming from all parts of the world in the interest of Christian unity, have with deep gratitude to God found ourselves united in common prayer, in God our heavenly Father and His Son Jesus Christ, our Saviour, in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit.

Notwithstanding the differences in doctrine among us, we are united in a common Christian Faith which is proclaimed in the Holy Scriptures and is witnessed to and safeguarded in the Oecumenical Creed, commonly called the Nicene, and in the Apostles' Creed, which Faith is continuously confirmed in the spiritual experience of the Church of Christ.

We believe that the Holy Spirit in leading the Church into all truth may enable it, while firmly adhering to the witness of these Creeds (our common heritage from the ancient Church), to express the truths of revelation in such other forms as new problems may from time to time demand.

Finally, we desire to leave on record our solemn and unanimous testimony that no external and written standards can suffice without an inward and personal experience of union with God in Christ.

NOTES

1. It must be noted that the Orthodox Eastern Church can accept the Nicene Creed only in its uninterpolated form without the *filioque* clause; and that although the Apostles' Creed has no place in the formularies of this Church, it is in accordance with its teaching.

2. It must be noted also that some of the Churches represented

in this Conference conjoin tradition with the Scriptures, some are explicit in subordinating Creeds to the Scriptures, some attach a primary importance to their particular Confessions, and some make no use of Creeds.

3. It is understood that the use of these Creeds will be determined by the competent authority in each Church, and that the several Churches will continue to make use of such special Confessions as they possess.

96. *The Ministry of the Church*

REPORT OF SECTION V

RECEIVED BY THE FULL CONFERENCE, *nem. con.*

AUGUST 20, 1927

We members of the Conference on Faith and Order are happy to report that we find ourselves in substantial accord in the following five propositions:

1. The ministry is a gift of God through Christ to His Church and is essential to the being and well-being of the Church.

2. The ministry is perpetually authorized and made effective through Christ and His Spirit.

3. The purpose of the ministry is to impart to men the saving and sanctifying benefits of Christ through pastoral service, the preaching of the Gospel, and the administration of the sacraments, to be made effective by faith.

4. The ministry is entrusted with the government and discipline of the Church, in whole or in part.

5. Men gifted for the work of the ministry, called by the Spirit and accepted by the Church, are commissioned through an act of ordination by prayer and the laying on of hands to exercise the function of this ministry.

Within the many Christian communions into which in the course of history Christendom has been divided, various forms of ministry have grown up according to the circumstances of the several communions and their beliefs as to the mind of Christ and the guidance of the New Testament. These communions have been, in God's providence, mani-

festly and abundantly used by the Holy Spirit in His work of enlightening the world, converting sinners, and perfecting saints. But the differences which have arisen in regard to the authority and functions of these various forms of ministry have been and are the occasion of manifold doubts, questions, and misunderstandings.

These differences concern the nature of the ministry (whether consisting of one or several orders), the nature of ordination and of the grace conferred thereby, the function and authority of Bishops, and the nature of Apostolic succession. We believe that the first step toward the overcoming of these difficulties is the frank recognition that they exist, and the clear definition of their nature. We therefore add as an appendix to our Report such a statement, commending it to the thoughtful consideration of the Churches we represent.

By these differences the difficulties of inter-communion have been accentuated to the distress and wounding of faithful souls, while in the mission field, where the Church is fulfilling its primary object to preach the Gospel to every creature, the young Churches find the lack of unity a very serious obstacle to the furtherance of the Gospel. Consequently the provision of a ministry acknowledged in every part of the Church as possessing the sanction of the whole Church is an urgent need.

There has not been time in this Conference to consider all the points of difference between us in the matter of the ministry with that care and patience which could alone lead to complete agreement. The same observation applies equally to proposals for the constitution of the united Church. Certain suggestions as to possible church organization have been made, which we transmit to the Churches with the earnest hope that common study of these questions will be continued by the members of the various Churches represented in this Conference.

In view of (1) the place which the Episcopate, the Councils of Presbyters, and the Congregation of the faithful, respectively, had in the constitution of the early Church, and (2) the fact that episcopal, presbyteral, and congregational systems of government are each to-day, and have been for centuries, accepted by great communions in Christendom, and (3) the fact that episcopal, presbyteral, and congregational systems are each believed by many to be essential to the good order of the Church, we therefore recognize that these several elements must all, under conditions which require further study, have an appropriate place in the order of life of a reunited Church, and that each separate communion, recalling the abundant blessing of God vouchsafed to its ministry in the past, should gladly bring to the common life of the united Church its own spiritual treasures.

If the foregoing suggestion be accepted and acted upon, it is essential that the acceptance of any special form of ordination as the regular and orderly method of introduction into the ministry of the Church for the future should not be interpreted to imply the acceptance of any one particular theory of the origin, character or function of any office in the Church, or to involve the acceptance of any adverse judgement on the validity of ordination in those branches of the Church universal that believe themselves to have retained valid and apostolic Orders under other forms of ordination; or as disowning or discrediting a past or present ministry of the Word and Sacrament which has been used and blessed by the Spirit of God.

It is further recognized that inasmuch as the Holy Spirit is bestowed upon every believer, and each believer has an immediate access to God through Jesus Christ, and since special gifts of the Holy Spirit, such as teaching, preaching, and spiritual counsel, are the treasures of the Church as well as of the individual, it is necessary and proper that the Church should make fuller use of such gifts for the develop-

ment of its corporate spiritual life and for the extension of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, our Lord.

In particular, we share in the conviction, repeatedly expressed in this Conference, that pending the solution of the questions of faith and order in which agreements have not yet been reached, it is possible for us, not simply as individuals but as Churches, to unite in the activities of brotherly service which Christ has committed to His disciples. We therefore commend to our Churches the consideration of the steps which may be immediately practicable to bring our existing unity in service to more effective expression.

In conclusion, we express our thankfulness to Almighty God for the great progress which has been made in recent years in the mutual approach of the Churches to one another, and our conviction that we must go forward with faith and courage, confident that with the blessing of God we shall be able to solve the problems that lie before us.

NOTES

1. The following is the view of the Orthodox Church, as formulated for us by its representatives.

'The Orthodox Church, regarding the ministry as instituted in the Church by Christ Himself, and as the body which by a special charisma is the organ through which the Church spreads its means of grace such as the sacraments, and believing that the ministry in its threefold form of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons can only be based on the unbroken apostolic succession, regrets that it is unable to come in regard to the ministry into some measure of agreement with many of the Churches represented at this Conference; but prays God that He, through His Holy Spirit, will guide to union even in regard to this difficult point of disagreement.'

2. In Western Christendom also there are conspicuous differences.

One representative view includes the following points: (a) that there have always been various grades of the ministry, each with its own function; (b) that ordination is a sacramental act of divine institution, and therefore indispensable, conveying the special charisma for the particular ministry; (c) that Bishops who have received their office by succession from the Apostles are the necessary ministers of ordination; (d) that the apostolic succession

so understood is necessary for the authority of the ministry, the visible unity of the Church, and the validity of the sacraments.

On the other hand it is held by many Churches represented in the Conference (a) that essentially there is only one ministry, that of the Word and Sacraments; (b) that the existing ministries in these Churches are agreeable to the New Testament, are proved by their fruits and have due authority in the Church, and the sacraments ministered by them are valid; (c) that no particular form of ministry is necessary to be received as a matter of faith; (d) that the grace which fits men for the ministry is immediately given by God, and is recognized, not conferred, in ordination.

Further we record that there are views concerning the ministry which are intermediate between the types just mentioned. For instance, some who adhere to an episcopal system of church government do not consider that the apostolic succession as described above is a vital element of episcopacy, or they reject it altogether. Others do not regard as essential the historic Episcopate. Those who adhere to presbyteral systems of church government believe that the apostolic ministry is transmissible and has been transmitted through Presbyters orderly associated for the purpose. Those who adhere to the congregational system of government define their ministry as having been and being transmitted according to the precedent and example of the New Testament.

97. *The Sacraments*

REPORT OF SECTION VI

RECEIVED BY THE FULL CONFERENCE, *nem. con.*

AUGUST 20, 1927

We are convinced that for the purpose in view in this Conference we should not go into detail in considering Sacraments—by some called 'Mysteries'. The purpose therefore of this statement is to show that there may be a common approach to and appreciation of Sacraments on the part of those who may otherwise differ in conception and interpretation.

We testify to the fact that the Christian world gives evidence of an increasing sense of the significance and value of Sacraments, and would express our belief that this movement should be fostered and guided as a means of deepening the life and experience of the Churches. In this connexion

we recognize that the Sacraments have special reference to the corporate life and fellowship of the Church and that the grace is conveyed by the Holy Spirit, taking of the things of Christ and applying them to the soul through Faith.

We agree that Sacraments are of divine appointment and that the Church ought thankfully to observe them as divine gifts.

We hold that in the Sacraments there is an outward sign and an inward grace, and that the Sacraments are means of grace through which God works invisibly in us. We recognize also that in the gifts of His grace God is not limited by His own Sacraments.

The Orthodox Church and others hold that there are seven Sacraments and that for their valid administration there must be a proper form, a proper matter, and a proper ministry. Others can regard only Baptism and the Lord's Supper as Sacraments. Others again, while attaching high value to the sacramental principle, do not make use of the outward signs of Sacraments, but hold that all spiritual benefits are given through immediate contact with God through His Spirit. In this Conference we lay stress on the two Sacraments of Baptism and Lord's Supper, because they are the Sacraments which are generally acknowledged by the members of this Conference.

We believe that in Baptism administered with water in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, for the remission of sins, we are baptized by one Spirit into one body. By this statement it is not meant to ignore the difference in conception, interpretation, and mode which exist among us.

We believe that in the Holy Communion our Lord is present, that we have fellowship with God our Father in Jesus Christ His Son, our Living Lord, who is our one Bread, given for the life of the world, sustaining the life of all His people, and that we are in fellowship with all others who are united to Him. We agree that the Sacrament of the

Lord's Supper is the Church's most sacred act of worship in which the Lord's atoning death is commemorated and proclaimed, and that it is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and an act of solemn self-oblation.

There are among us divergent views, especially as to (1) the mode and manner of the presence of our Lord; (2) the conception of the commemoration and the sacrifice; (3) the relation of the elements to the grace conveyed; and (4) the relation between the minister of this Sacrament and the validity and efficacy of the rite. We are aware that the reality of the divine presence and gift in this Sacrament cannot be adequately apprehended by human thought or expressed in human language.

We close this statement with the prayer that the differences which prevent full communion at the present time may be removed.

98. Foreword to the Report on Subject VII

The report of Section VII, on the Unity of Christendom and the relation thereto of existing Churches, was presented to the Conference on Thursday, August 18, 1927, by the Chairman of the Section, the Archbishop of Upsala, and after discussion, in which various amendments were proposed, 'was referred to the Drafting Committee for the consideration of the proposed amendments'. The text of the first draft, together with an abstract of the discussion, is found in the official Proceedings of the Conference ('Faith and Order'), pp. 396-403.

In the absence of the Archbishop of Upsala, a revision of the Report was presented to the full Conference on Saturday, August 20, by the Archbishop of Armagh, the Vice-Chairman of the Section. After debate, in which it appeared that the revision would not receive the unanimous approval of the Conference, the President suggested as a proposal likely to meet all difficulties 'that the Report should be received

by the Conference in the same way as the other reports, but on the understanding that it should be referred to the Continuation Committee for further consideration,' it being further explained 'that the Continuation Committee would take such action as it considered advisable in view of the knowledge it had of the situation'. This proposal was adopted by the Conference. The text of the revised report, together with a brief abstract of the discussion which followed, is found in the Proceedings of the Conference, pp. 435-9.

At a meeting of the Continuation Committee held on August 20, 1927, the following action was taken:

With reference to the Report on Subject VII which had been received by the World Conference on Faith and Order for transmission to the Continuation Committee, it was agreed that a committee be appointed with the duty of considering the whole situation with regard to Subject VII and reporting back to the Business Committee. The following were named:

Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Gloucester, Convener

Rev. William Adams Brown, D.D.

Rt. Rev. James De Wolf Perry, D.D.

Gen.-Sup. D. Dr. Otto Dibelius

Rev. Timothy Tingfang Lew, Ph.D.

At the suggestion of the President of the Conference, the Archbishop of Upsala was afterwards added to the Committee.

Acting under the instructions thus given, the Committee prepared a revised draft of Report on Subject VII in which, without introducing any new matter of their own, they endeavoured to meet the criticisms which had been made of the Report in its earlier forms by rearrangement of material, by more exact reference to previous actions of the Conference itself, and by following more consistently the precedent set in earlier reports of stating alternative positions where there was difference of view.

In the course of its deliberations the Committee received valuable suggestions from many members of the Conference, especially from the Archbishop of Armagh, Professor Merle d'Aubigné, and Archbishop Germanos. The latter contributed valuable notes on the attitude of the Orthodox Church to certain points raised in the Report.

The Report, thus amended and revised, was presented to the Business Committee on December 21, 1927, and after full consideration and the adoption of certain minor amendments is by them submitted to the churches for such consideration as they may desire to give it.

99. *The Unity of Christendom and the relation thereto of existing Churches*

REPORT ON SUBJECT VII

PRESENTED WITH AMENDMENTS TO THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE, AND SUBMITTED TO THE CHURCHES

DECEMBER 1927

Reports II to VI register the degree of unity in the conception of the Church to which the Conference has thus far attained. It remains in this closing report to consider the consequences which follow for the existing churches.

I

Report II declares that 'the message of the Church to the world is and must always remain the Gospel of Jesus Christ . . . the joyful message of redemption, both here and hereafter, the gift of God to sinful man in Jesus Christ'.

Report III declares that 'God who has given us the Gospel for the salvation of the world has appointed His Church to witness by life and word to its redeeming power. . . . As there is but one Christ, and one life in Him, and one Holy Spirit who guides into all truth, so there is and can be but one Church, holy, catholic, and apostolic.'

Report IV declares that 'notwithstanding the differences in doctrine among us, we are united in a common Christian Faith which is proclaimed in the Holy Scriptures and is witnessed to and safeguarded in the Oecumenical Creed, commonly called the Nicene, and in the Apostles' Creed, which Faith is continually confirmed in the spiritual experience of the Church of Christ'.

Report V declares that 'the ministry is a gift of God through Christ to His Church and is essential to the being and well-being of the Church. . . . The purpose of the ministry is to impart to men the saving and sanctifying benefits of Christ through pastoral service, the preaching of the Gospel, and the administration of the sacraments, to be made effective by faith.'

Report VI declares that 'Sacraments are of divine appointment and that the Church ought thankfully to observe them as divine gifts'; that they 'have special reference to the corporate life and fellowship of the Church and that the grace is conveyed by the Holy Spirit, taking of the things of Christ and applying them to the soul through faith'.

II

The unity of the Church implies a unity in Faith and Order, but it does not mean uniformity. There must be space for divers types of expression, provided that those things which safeguard the unity in essentials are maintained. The various communions should bring into the common life of the Church those elements which express their characteristic gifts, so that nothing of the rich variety which marks Christian experience will be lost, and the liberty of interpretation within the limits of the accepted faith will be preserved.

Further, there are differences as to the ultimate form which it is God's will His Church should take. Some hold that this form 'was determined by Christ Himself and is

therefore unchangeable; others that the one Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit may express itself in varying forms' (Report III), and therefore make place in their view of the Church of the future for diversity of doctrine, worship, and order. Still others admit diversity of worship and order, but not of doctrine.

This difference of ideal affects the view taken of the steps through which the ideal is to be reached, some interpreting the limit of legitimate variation in doctrinal statement and in the administration of church ordinances more strictly than others; but there is widespread agreement that there must be some unity of faith and practice and some liberty of interpretation as to the nature of sacramental grace and of ministerial order and authority. (See the appended 'Note to Section II'.)

III

As the individual disciple is known by his fruits, so the unity of the disciples is shown by their fellowship in the service of the Master. Report V declares that, 'pending the solution of the questions of faith and order in which agreements have not yet been reached, it is possible for us, not simply as individuals but as Churches, to unite in the activities of brotherly service which Christ has committed to His disciples'; but there is difference as to the exact form this co-operation should take.

In his Encyclical Letter of 1920, the Oecumenical Patriarch proposed 'that a league or council of the churches should be formed for practical purposes'¹. It has been suggested that such a council might be evolved from already existing organizations, such as the Continuation Committee on Life and Work, consisting of representatives officially appointed by almost all the Christian Communions, and other organizations of similar nature. Some of us believe that such a

¹ See *Document* No. 13 *supra*. [Editor.]

council if formed should include, as its two branches, questions of life and work and of faith and order. Others believe that, for the present, it would be wiser for the movements represented by Stockholm and Lausanne to develop in independence, each following its own way; but there is general agreement that ultimately life, work, faith, and order are expressions of an existing spiritual unity, and that each requires the other for its complete fruition. 'We therefore commend to our Churches the consideration of the steps which may be immediately practicable to bring our existing unity in service to more effective expression' (Report V).

IV

As material for such consideration, the following suggestions which it was impossible adequately to discuss at Lausanne are passed on to the churches:

1. In preparation for closer fellowship, each communion should seek more intimate knowledge of the faith and life, worship and order of the others. Differences which are the outgrowth of complicated historical developments may preserve some aspect of truth or of life which is of value to the church as a whole, or they may sometimes prove to be less important than they are supposed to be. As the different communions come to know one another better, they will grow in understanding and in appreciation of one another.

2. It has not been possible for the Conference to consider with the care which it deserves the relation of the existing churches to one another or the place which each or any of them may hold in the undivided church. We commend to the churches the suggestions which have been made on this subject in the addresses delivered at the Conference. In the meantime, we welcome the movement already under way for the union of bodies of similar doctrine, polity, and worship, and trust that it may continue with ever greater success.

3. Pending the complete, organic union of the different churches, we note with satisfaction a number of movements for practical co-operation along social, evangelistic, and other lines. Experience shows that it has been possible for widely separate bodies to co-operate in such movements with mutual profit and without surrender of principle. (See the appended 'Notes to Section IV', Note A.) There is abundant evidence that when communions undertake together the divine task of bringing the love of Christ to those who do not know Him, they become closer to one another. Especially we commend to the churches the consideration of what steps can be taken to eliminate needless overlapping and competition in the local community; that in ways consistent with the genius of the several communions, our existing unity in Christ may be manifest to the world. (See the appended 'Notes to Section IV', Note B.)

V

We note with gratitude to God the recent increase of effective co-operation in the mission field. The purpose of all missionary work is to carry the eternal Gospel to the ends of the earth, so that it may meet the spiritual needs of every nation and bring all men to the Saviour. Here more than anywhere else unity is essential. We note with sympathy the degree of union which has already been attained in many countries and the plans which are proposed for further union. We commend these plans to the churches for their careful consideration.

The demand which comes from the churches of the Mission field is that the Churches at home should grant them greater freedom of action, and that their hopes of unity should not be frustrated by the long-continued acquiescence in disunion at home which makes it difficult to recognize how fatal disunion is to the new indigenous churches.

VI

Complete fellowship in the Church will be realized only when the way is opened for all God's children to join in communion at the Lord's table. Through prayer and thoughtful deliberation the steps must be found which will most effectively lead to this goal. Ambiguous statements and hasty measures may hinder rather than hasten the work of unification. Yet if we are ever to become one, we must not shrink from the task. Some of us believe that full communion can be reached only at the end of the process of unification; others that it may be used by God as the means to that end. Whatever the way to the goal, complete unity will require that the Churches be so transformed that there may be full recognition of one another by members of all communions.

Nothing will do more to hasten the union for which we all long than that in our daily prayer, both as individuals and as churches, we should remember one another. It has been suggested that a common prayer be sent out in the name of the Conference to be used at a convenient time by all Christian Churches. Especially would we bear on our hearts before God our brethren who are passing through suffering, praying that grace may be given to them to stand firm under their afflictions, and that to them and to us alike, God will grant the spirit of sacrifice as we remember the word of the Lord Jesus: 'If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow Me.' God give us, both as individuals and as churches, wisdom and courage to do His will.

NOTE TO SECTION II

It must be noted that representatives of the Orthodox Church would guard their acceptance of any diversity in matters of Faith and Order (Section II) by the following limitations.

(a) The types of expression so far as these types have been established by Oecumenical Synods must be maintained.

(b) Liberty of interpretation comes within the sphere of the Church as a whole and not of different sections or individuals.

(c) They cannot agree that 'there must be some liberty of interpretation as to the nature of sacramental grace, and of ministerial order and authority'.

(d) They admit differences in worship so long as they do not diverge from the common doctrinal basis, on which is based the Holy Worship as handed down from the times of the Apostles.

NOTES TO SECTION IV, PAR. 3

A. There are some who believe that co-operation should take the form of federation, either local, national, or international: others oppose federation, fearing that it may become a substitute for complete organic union. In the interest of clarity of thought it is important to remember that the word 'federation' is used in at least three different senses. It may denote either

1. A substitute for organic union.
2. A step on the road to organic union.
3. A form of organic union.

In discussing federation it is important to make clear in which of these different senses the word is used.

B. It is suggested that in the case of communions of similar doctrine and polity, the desired expression of unity may often be secured by the method of denominational comity. In the case of those communions which are separated by fundamental differences of view, the problem is more difficult and will require special consideration.

100. Concluding Statement

DRAFTED BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CONFERENCE
AT ITS REQUEST. AUGUST 1927

We have finished our immediate task. From first to last we are able to express it in constructive terms written and received, whether they be statements of agreement or statements of difference, in brotherly love and mutual consideration. They are the product of the minds of men who earnestly desired and strove to place and keep themselves under the guidance of God's Holy Spirit. Human imperfections which mingle with them we pray God to pardon. In

offering to Him our handiwork, we are but returning to Him that which He has given to us. We pray His acceptance of and blessing upon our offering.

However, we have not finished our whole task. We have but taken a step on a long journey. The Conference was only a new starting point. What we did there will crumble into dust unless the representatives at Lausanne bring home to their several Churches the duty and responsibility of studying the Reports which they themselves received for this very purpose. The Conference should be repeated in every main ecclesiastical assembly, as well as in each separate congregation, throughout our entire Christian constituency if we are to take full advantage of the progress registered. By our presence and activity at Lausanne we are solemnly pledged to reproduce, each in his own local circle, the spirit and method which made the World Conference on Faith and Order what it was. 'I pray you to give me the utter joy of knowing you are living in harmony, with the same feelings of love, with one heart and soul, never acting for private ends or from vanity, but humbly considering each other the better man, and each with an eye to the interests of others as well as to his own. Treat one another with the same spirit as you experience in Christ Jesus.'¹

We who have been privileged to labour together have done so in the joyousness of unhampered freedom. We must not forget, in the liberty which is to us a commonplace, the sufferings which some of our Christian brethren are at this very moment undergoing. Deprived of liberty, in hostile surroundings, their cry goes up to God from the house of their martyrdom. Our prayers enfold them and our sympathy stretches out affectionate arms toward them.

Finally, we commend the Christian Churches, whether represented in the Conference or not, to our Heavenly Father's guidance and safe keeping, looking earnestly to-

¹ Phil. ii. 2-5. Moffatt's translation.

ward the day when the full mind of God will control all the affairs of mankind.

101. *Declaration on behalf of the Eastern
Orthodox Church*

[Read in English by the Metropolitan of Thyateira (Germanos) to the full session of the World Conference prior to the discussion of Reports VI and VII.]

AUGUST 18, 1927

Brethren, on receiving the invitation of the Organizing Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order seven years ago, the Orthodox Church answered readily by sending representatives from her particular Orthodox Churches to the preliminary Conference in 1920 at Geneva. That delegation of the Orthodox Church put before the Conference a united declaration in general terms of the teaching of their Church in the matter of faith and order, and at its conclusion recommended that before any discussion of the reunion of the Churches in faith and order, a League of Churches should be established for their mutual co-operation in regard to the social and moral principles of Christendom. Further, when the Orthodox Church was invited a short time ago to take part through her representatives in the present Conference, although many of her particular Churches are in distress so grave as to threaten their very existence, she hastened to send her delegation to it.

Accordingly, we, the undersigned, delegates of the Orthodox Church, being inspired by a sincere feeling of love and by a desire to achieve an understanding, have taken part in every meeting held here for the purpose of promoting closer brotherhood and fellowship between the representatives of the different Churches and for the general good and welfare of the whole body of Christians. But while sharing the general labours of the Conference both in delivering addresses

as arranged in the programme and in taking part in the open debates, as also in the work of the Sections, we have concluded with regret that the bases assumed for the foundation of the Reports, which are to be submitted to the vote of the Conference, are inconsistent with the principles of the Orthodox Church which we represent.

Therefore, we judge it to be a matter of conscience that with the exception of the first we must abstain from voting in favour of the two Reports which are now ready. Although both in the papers read, in speeches, in debate and in statements made in the three Sections, we Orthodox have already made plain and clear what are the points of view and the conceptions of the Orthodox Church in regard to the subjects under discussion, we hold it to be of importance that we should specify here certain points in order to make manifest the differences which separate us from other members of the Conference. For example, while the Report on the Message of the Church, since it is drafted on the basis of the teaching of the Holy Scripture, is in accordance with the Orthodox conception and can be accepted by us, it is otherwise with the two other Reports, on the Nature of the Church and upon the Common Confession of the Faith of the Church. The drafting of these two latter was carried out on a basis of compromise between what in our understanding are conflicting ideas and meanings, in order to arrive at an external agreement in the letter alone: whereas, as has often at other times been emphasized in statement by representatives of the Orthodox Church, in matters of faith and conscience there is room for no compromise. For us, two different meanings cannot be covered by, and two different concepts cannot be deduced from, the same words of a generally agreed statement. Nor can we Orthodox hope that an agreement reached upon such statements would remain lasting.

That the drafting committees have realized the existence

of this disagreement is apparent from many of the notes which they have placed in the Reports and which leave full liberty upon matters which at least we Orthodox hold to be fundamental. Thus, for example, we Orthodox cannot conceive a united Church in which some of its members would hold that there is only one source of divine revelation, namely, Holy Scripture alone; but others would affirm that apostolic tradition is the necessary completion of Holy Scripture. While the full freedom so accorded in the Report to each Church to use its own confession of faith would make those confessions of indifferent value in themselves, on the other hand, nothing but confusion as to the one common conception of *the* Faith of the so united single Church could arise.

The Orthodox Church adheres fixedly to the principle that the limits of individual liberty of belief are determined by the definitions made by the whole Church, which definitions we maintain to be obligatory on each individual. This principle holds good for us not only as to the present members of the Orthodox Church, but also as to those who, in future, may become united with it in faith and order. Moreover, the symbols which would be accepted by the united Church acquire their importance (in our conception as Orthodox) not only from the fact of their being historical witnesses of the faith of the primitive Church, but above all because the Church has affirmed their validity in her Oecumenical Councils. It should be unnecessary for us to add that the Orthodox Church recognizes and accepts as an Oecumenical Symbol only the Creed of Nicea-Constantinople.

That which holds good for us in regard to the Oecumenical Symbol holds good also in regard to the dogmatic definitions of the Seven Oecumenical Councils, the authority of which no Orthodox would be justified in shaking.

Therefore the mind of the Orthodox Church is that re-union can take place only on the basis of the common faith

and confession of the ancient, undivided Church of the seven Oecumenical Councils and of the first eight centuries.

Although the Reports of the other three Sections are not yet to hand, the process of debate upon them makes it evident that agreement on them can be reached only by vague phrases, or by a compromise of antithetical opinions. Thus, for example, we cannot conceive how agreement can be made possible between two conceptions which agree that the existence of the ministry of the Church is by the will of Christ, but differ as to whether that ministry was instituted by Christ Himself in its three degrees of bishop, priest, and deacon. In the same way we judge there to be no practical value in an agreed formula as to the necessity of sacraments in the Church, when there is a fundamental difference between the Churches not only in regard to their number but also as to their particular effects.

This being so, we cannot entertain the idea of a reunion which is confined to a few common points of verbal statement; for according to the Orthodox Church where the totality of the faith is absent there can be no *communio in sacris*.

Nor can we here apply that principle of economy which in the past the Orthodox Church has applied under quite other circumstances in the case of those who came to her with a view to union with her.

In consequence, while we, the undersigned Orthodox representatives, must refrain from agreeing to any Reports other than that upon the Message of the Church, which we accept and are ready to vote upon, we desire to declare that in our judgement the most which we can now do is to enter into co-operation with other Churches in the social and moral sphere on a basis of Christian love. Further, we desire to add that as Orthodox Delegates we should view a partial reunion of those Churches which share the same principles with satisfaction as a precedent to general reunion, inasmuch

as it would thus be easier for our Orthodox Church to discuss reunion with the Churches which had so united into a single Church and had a single faith, than with many Churches with different faiths.

In making it plain that we have arrived at our decision only in obedience to the dictates of our conscience we beg to assure the Conference that we have derived much comfort here from the experience that, although divided by dogmatic differences, we are one with our brethren here in faith in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Declaring that in the future we shall not cease to devote ourselves to labour for the closer approach of the Churches, we add that we shall pray to God without ceasing that by the operation of His Holy Spirit He will take away all existing hindrances and will guide us to that unity for which the Founder and Ruler of the Church prayed to His heavenly Father: 'that they all may be one as we are one.'

We close with the intercession that our Lord will richly give His blessing to one and all who labour in sincerity and in His fear for the establishment of His kingdom among men.

Delegates from the Oecumenical Patriarchate: GERMANOS, Archbishop of Thyateira; MICHAEL CONSTANINIDIS, Archimandrite; Dr. PARASKEVAIDIS, Archimandrite; C. VALIADIS, Archimandrite.

The Patriarchate of Alexandria: CHRISTOPHOROS, Archbishop of Leontopolis; NICOLAS, Archbishop of Nubia.

The Patriarchate of Jerusalem: KALLINICOS, Archimandrite; BENEDICTOS, Deacon.

Archbishopric of Cyprus and the Church of Greece: AMBROSIOS, Metropolitan of Naupactos; CONSTANTINE DIOBOUNIOTIS; H. ALIVISATOS; D. S. BALANOS.

The Patriarchate of Serbia: IRINEY, Bishop of Novi Sad.

The Patriarchate of Roumania: NECTARIE, Archbishop of Cernauti and Metropolitan of Bukovina.

Declaration of the Eastern Orthodox Church 187

The Church of Bulgaria: Proto-presbyter Prof. Dr. STEFAN ZANKOW; Professor NICHOLAS GLUBOKOWSKY, D.D.

The Church of Poland: DIONISY, Metropolitan of Warsaw and all Poland; Archpriest BENEDICT J. TURKEVICH; Dr. NICOLAS ARSENIOW.

Russian Delegates: EULOGIOS, Metropolitan of the Russian Church in Western Europe; Archpriest Prof. Dr. SERGIUS BULGAKOW.

Georgian Delegate: Dr. GREGORY PERADSE.

II. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

112. Question concerning Conferences (as is alleged) to promote the Unity of all Christian People

ACTS OF THE SACRED CONGREGATIONS

THE SUPREME SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE

(Acta Apostolicae Sedis, 1 August 1927)

[With special reference to the World Conference on Faith and Order]

On the occasion of the conference which is to be held from the 3rd to the 21st of the coming month of August at

Lausanne in Switzerland, a question is addressed to the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office:

‘Whether it be lawful for Catholics to be present at or to countenance the conferences, gatherings, assemblies, or associations of non-Catholics which assume that all or any who claim for themselves the name of Christian are joined together in a single bond of religion?’

In the General Congregation, on Wednesday July 6, 1927, their Eminences the Most Reverend the Lord Cardinals, Inquisitors General in matters of faith and morals, ordered that the following reply be made:

‘In the Negative, and further that the decree issued by this same Sacred Congregation on July 4, 1919, entitled *De participatione catholicorum societatis* is altogether binding in matters pertaining to the promotion of Christian unity.’

Our most holy Lord Pius, by divine providence the eleventh pope of that name, on the following Thursday, on the 7th day of the same month and year, in the usual audience granted to the Reverend Father, the Lord Assessor to the Holy Office, approved the resolution of their Eminences submitted to him and ordered the publication thereof.

Given at Rome, at the Palace of the Holy Office, July 8, 1927.

ALOISIUS CASTELLANO

Notary of the Sup. Sac. Cong. of the Holy Office.

113. *Encyclical Letter (Mortalium Animos) on fostering True Religious Union of Our Most Holy Lord Pius XI, by Divine Providence Pope*

(January 6, 1928)

VENERABLE BRETHREN, HEALTH AND APOSTOLIC BLESSING,

Never perhaps in the past have the minds of men been so engrossed as they are to-day with the desire to strengthen and extend for the common good of mankind that tie of

brotherhood—the result of our common origin and nature—which binds us all so closely together. The world does not yet fully enjoy the fruits of peace; on the contrary, dissensions old and new in various lands still issue in rebellions and conflict. Such disputes, affecting the tranquil prosperity of nations, can never be settled without the combined and active goodwill of those who are responsible for their government, and hence it is easy to understand—especially now that the unity of mankind is no longer called into question—the widespread desire that all nations, in view of this universal kinship, should daily find closer union with one another.

It is with a similar motive that efforts are being made by some, in connexion with the New Law promulgated by Christ our Lord. Assured that there exist few men who are entirely devoid of the religious sense, they seem to ground on this belief a hope that all nations, while differing indeed in religious matters, may yet without great difficulty be brought to fraternal agreement on certain points of doctrine which will form a common basis of the spiritual life. With this object congresses, meetings, and addresses are arranged, attended by a large concourse of hearers, where all without distinction, unbelievers of every kind as well as Christians, even those who unhappily have rejected Christ and denied His divine nature or mission, are invited to join in the discussion. Now, such efforts can meet with no kind of approval among Catholics. They presuppose the erroneous view that all religions are more or less good and praiseworthy, inasmuch as all give expression, under various forms, to that innate sense which leads men to God and to the obedient acknowledgement of His rule. Those who hold such a view are not only in error; they distort the true idea of religion, and thus reject it, falling gradually into naturalism and atheism. To favour this opinion, therefore, and to encourage such undertakings is tantamount to abandoning the religion revealed by God.

Nevertheless, when there is a question of fostering unity among Christians, it is easy for many to be misled by the apparent excellence of the object to be achieved. Is it not right, they ask, is it not the obvious duty of all who invoke the name of Christ to refrain from mutual reproaches and at last to be united in charity? Dare any one say that he loves Christ, and yet not strive with all his might to accomplish the desire of Him Who asked His Father that His disciples might be 'one' (John xvii. 21)? Did not Christ will that mutual charity should be the distinguishing characteristic of His disciples? 'By this shall all men know that you are My disciples, if you have love one for another' (John xiii. 35). If only all Christians were 'one', it is contended, then they might do so much more to drive out the pest of irreligion which with its insidious and far-reaching advance is threatening to sap the strength of the Gospel. These and similar arguments, with amplifications, are constantly on the lips of the 'pan-Christians' who, so far from being a few isolated individuals, have formed an entire class and grouped themselves into societies of extensive membership, usually under the direction of non-Catholics, who also disagree in matters of faith. The energy with which this scheme is being promoted has won for it many adherents, and even many Catholics are attracted by it, since it holds out the hope of a union apparently consonant with the wishes of Holy Mother Church, whose chief desire it is to recall her erring children and to bring them back to her bosom. In reality, however, these fair and alluring words cloak a most grave error, subversive of the foundations of the Catholic faith.

Conscious, therefore, of Our Apostolic office, which warns Us not to allow the flock of Christ to be led astray by harmful fallacies, We invoke your zeal, Venerable Brethren, to avert this evil. We feel confident that each of you, by written and spoken word, will explain clearly to the people

the principles and arguments that We are about to set forth, so that Catholics may know what view and what course of action they should adopt regarding schemes for the promiscuous union into one body of all who call themselves Christians.

God, the Creator of all things, made us that we might know Him and serve Him; to our service, therefore, He has a full right. He might indeed have been contented to prescribe for man's government the natural law alone, that is, the law which in creation He has written upon man's heart, and have regulated the progress of that law by His ordinary Providence. He willed, however, to make positive laws which we should obey, and progressively, from the beginnings of the human race until the coming and preaching of Jesus Christ, He Himself taught mankind the duties which a rational creature owes to his Creator. 'God, Who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all in these days hath spoken to us by His Son' (Heb. i. 1, seq.). Evidently, therefore, no religion can be true save that which rests upon the revelation of God, a revelation begun from the very first, continued under the Old Law, and brought to completion by Jesus Christ Himself under the New. Now, if God has spoken—and it is historically certain that He has in fact spoken—then it is clearly man's duty implicitly to believe His revelation and to obey His commands. That we might rightly do both, for the glory of God and for our own salvation, the only-begotten Son of God founded His Church on earth. None, we think, of those who claim to be Christians will deny that a Church, and one sole Church, was founded by Christ.

On the further question, however, as to what in the intention of its Founder was to be the precise nature of that Church, there is not the same agreement. Many of them, for

example, deny that the Church of Christ was intended to be visible and manifest, at any rate in the sense that it was to be visibly the one body of the faithful, agreeing in one and the same doctrine under one teaching and governing authority. They conceive the visible Church as nothing more than a federation of the various Christian communities, even though these may hold different and mutually exclusive doctrines. The truth is that Christ founded His Church as a perfect society, of its nature external and perceptible to the senses, which in the future should carry on the work of the salvation of mankind under one head, with a living teaching authority, administering the sacraments which are the sources of heavenly grace (John iii. 5, vi. 48-59, xx. 22 seq.; cf. Matt. xviii. 18, &c.). Wherefore He compared His Church to a kingdom (Matt. xiii.), to a house (cf. Matt. xvi. 18), to a sheepfold (John x. 16), and to a flock (John xxi. 15-17). The Church thus wondrously instituted could not cease to exist with the death of its Founder and of the Apostles, the pioneers of its propagation; for its mission was to lead all men to salvation, without distinction of time or place: 'Going therefore, teach ye all nations' (Matt. xxviii. 19). Nor could the Church ever lack the effective strength necessary for the continued accomplishment of its task, since Christ Himself is perpetually present with it, according to His promise: 'Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world' (Matt. xxviii. 20). Hence not only must the Church still exist to-day and continue always to exist, but it must ever be exactly the same as it was in the days of the Apostles. Otherwise we must say—which God forbid—that Christ has failed in His purpose, or that He erred when He asserted of His Church that the gates of hell should never prevail against it (Matt. xvi. 18).

And here it will be opportune to expound and to reject a certain false opinion which lies at the root of this question and of that complex movement by which non-Catholics seek

to bring about the union of Christian Churches. Those who favour this view constantly quote the words of Christ, 'That they may be one. . . . And there shall be one fold, and one shepherd' (John xvii. 21, x. 16), in the sense that Christ thereby merely expressed a desire or a prayer which as yet has not been granted. For they hold that the unity of faith and government which is a note of the one true Church of Christ has up to the present time hardly ever existed, and does not exist to-day. They consider that this unity is indeed to be desired and may even, by co-operation and goodwill, be actually attained, but that meanwhile it must be regarded as a mere ideal. The Church, they say, is of its nature divided into sections, composed of several churches or distinct communities which still remain separate, and although holding in common some articles of doctrine, nevertheless differ concerning the remainder; that all these enjoy the same rights; and that the Church remained one and undivided at the most only from the Apostolic age until the first Oecumenical Councils. Hence, they say, controversies and long-standing differences, which to-day still keep asunder the members of the Christian family, must be entirely set aside, and from the residue of doctrines a common form of faith drawn up and proposed for belief, in the profession of which all may not only know but also feel themselves to be brethren. If the various Churches or communities were united in some kind of universal federation, they would then be in a position to oppose resolutely and successfully the progress of irreligion.

Such, Venerable Brethren, is the common contention. There are indeed some who recognize and affirm that Protestantism has with inconsiderate zeal rejected certain articles of faith and external ceremonies which are in fact useful and attractive, and which the Roman Church still retains. But they immediately go on to say that the Roman Church, too, has erred, and corrupted the primitive religion

by adding to it and proposing for belief doctrines not only alien to the Gospel but contrary to its spirit. Chief among these they count that of the primacy of jurisdiction granted to Peter and to his successors in the See of Rome. There are actually some, though few, who grant to the Roman Pontiff a primacy of honour and even a certain power or jurisdiction ; this, however, they consider to arise not from the divine law but merely from the consent of the faithful. Others, again, even go so far as to desire the Pontiff himself to preside over their mixed assemblies. For the rest, while you may hear many non-Catholics loudly preaching brotherly communion in Jesus Christ, yet not one will you find to whom it ever occurs with devout submission to obey the Vicar of Jesus Christ in his capacity of teacher or ruler. Meanwhile they assert their readiness to treat with the Church of Rome, but on equal terms, as equals with an equal. But even if they could so treat, there seems little doubt that they would do so only on condition that no pact into which they might enter should compel them to retract those opinions which still keep them outside the one fold of Christ.

This being so, it is clear that the Apostolic See can by no means take part in these assemblies, nor is it in any way lawful for Catholics to give to such enterprises their encouragement or support. If they did so, they would be giving countenance to a false Christianity quite alien to the one Church of Christ. Shall we commit the iniquity of suffering the truth, the truth revealed by God, to be made a subject for compromise? For it is indeed a question of defending revealed truth. Jesus Christ sent His Apostles into the whole world to declare the faith of the Gospel to every nation, and, to save them from error, He willed that the Holy Ghost should first teach them all truth. Has this doctrine, then, disappeared, or at any time been obscured, in the Church of which God Himself is the ruler and guardian? Our Redeemer plainly said that His Gospel was intended not

only for the apostolic age but for all time. Can the object of faith, then, have become in the process of time so dim and uncertain that to-day we must tolerate contradictory opinions? If this were so, then we should have to admit that the coming of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, the perpetual indwelling of the same Spirit in the Church, nay, the very preaching of Jesus Christ, have centuries ago lost their efficacy and value. To affirm this would be blasphemy. The only-begotten Son of God not only bade His representatives to teach all nations; He also obliged all men to give credence to whatever was taught them by 'witnesses preordained by God' (Acts x. 41). Moreover, He enforced His command with this sanction: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be condemned' (Mark xvi. 16). These two commands, the one to teach, the other to believe for salvation, must be obeyed. But they cannot even be understood unless the Church proposes an inviolate and clear teaching, and in proposing it is immune from all danger of error. It is also false to say that, although the deposit of truth does indeed exist, yet it is to be found only with such laborious effort and after such lengthy study and discussion, that a man's life is hardly long enough for its discovery and attainment. This would be equivalent to saying that the most merciful God spoke through the prophets and through His only-begotten Son merely in order that some few men, and those advanced in years, might learn what He had revealed, and not in order to inculcate a doctrine of faith and morals by which man should be guided throughout the whole of his life.

These pan-Christians who strive for the union of the Churches would appear to pursue the noblest of ideals in promoting charity among all Christians. But how should charity tend to the detriment of faith? Every one knows that John himself, the Apostle of love, who seems in his Gospel to have revealed the secrets of the Sacred Heart of

Jesus, and who never ceased to impress upon the memory of his disciples the new commandment 'to love one another', nevertheless strictly forbade any intercourse with those who professed a mutilated and corrupt form of Christ's teaching: 'If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house, nor say to him, God speed you' (2 John 10).

Therefore, since the foundation of charity is faith pure and inviolate, it is chiefly by the bond of one faith that the disciples of Christ are to be united. A federation of Christians, then, is inconceivable in which each member retains his own opinions and private judgement in matters of faith, even though they differ from the opinions of all the rest. How can men with opposite convictions belong to one and the same federation of the faithful: those who accept sacred Tradition as a source of revelation and those who reject it; those who recognize as divinely constituted the hierarchy of bishops, priests, and ministers in the Church, and those who regard it as gradually introduced to suit the conditions of the time; those who adore Christ really present in the Most Holy Eucharist through that wonderful conversion of the bread and wine, transubstantiation, and those who assert that the body of Christ is there only by faith or by the signification and virtue of the sacrament; those who in the Eucharist recognize both sacrament and sacrifice, and those who say that it is nothing more than the memorial of the Lord's supper; those who think it right and useful to pray to the Saints reigning with Christ, especially to Mary the Mother of God, and to venerate their images, and those who refuse such veneration as derogatory to the honour due to Jesus Christ, 'the one mediator of God and men' (cf. 1 Tim. ii. 5)?

How so great a variety of opinions can clear the way for the unity of the Church, We know not. That unity can arise only from one teaching authority, one law of belief, and one

faith of Christians. But we do know that from such a state of affairs it is but an easy step to the neglect of religion or 'indifferentism', and to the error of the modernists, who hold that dogmatic truth is not absolute but relative, that is, that it changes according to the varying necessities of time and place and the varying tendencies of the mind; that it is not contained in an immutable tradition, but can be altered to suit the needs of human life.

Furthermore, it is never lawful to employ in connexion with articles of faith the distinction invented by some between 'fundamental' and 'non-fundamental' articles, the former to be accepted by all, the latter being left to the free acceptance of the faithful. The supernatural virtue of faith has as its formal motive the authority of God revealing, and this allows of no such distinction. All true followers of Christ, therefore, will believe the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God with the same faith as they believe the mystery of the august Trinity, the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff in the sense defined by the Oecumenical Vatican Council with the same faith as they believe the Incarnation of our Lord. That these truths have been solemnly sanctioned and defined by the Church at various times, some of them even quite recently, makes no difference to their certainty, nor to our obligation of believing them. Has not God revealed them all?

The teaching authority of the Church in the divine wisdom was constituted on earth in order that the revealed doctrines might remain for ever intact and might be brought with ease and security to the knowledge of men. This authority is indeed daily exercised through the Roman Pontiff and the Bishops who are in communion with him; but it has the further office of defining some truth with solemn decree whenever it is opportune, and whenever this is necessary either to oppose the errors or the attacks of heretics, or again to impress the minds of the faithful with a clearer

and more detailed explanation of the articles of sacred doctrine. But in the use of this extraordinary teaching authority no fresh invention is introduced, nothing new is ever added to the number of those truths which are at least implicitly contained within the deposit of Revelation divinely committed to the Church; but truths which to some perhaps may still seem obscure are rendered clear, or a truth which some may have called into question is declared to be of faith.

Thus, Venerable Brethren, it is clear why this Apostolic See has never allowed its subjects to take part in the assemblies of non-Catholics. There is but one way in which the unity of Christians may be fostered, and that is by furthering the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who are separated from it; for from that one true Church they have in the past fallen away. The one Church of Christ is visible to all, and will remain, according to the will of its Author, exactly the same as He instituted it. The mystical Spouse of Christ has never in the course of centuries been contaminated, nor in the future can she ever be, as Cyprian bears witness: 'The Bride of Christ cannot become false to her Spouse; she is inviolate and pure. She knows but one dwelling, and chastely and modestly she guards the sanctity of the nuptial chamber' (*De Cath. Ecclesiae unitate*, 6). The same holy martyr marvelled that any one could believe that 'this unity of the Church built upon a divine foundation, knit together by heavenly sacraments, could ever be rent asunder by the conflict of wills' (*ibid.*). For since the mystical body of Christ, like His physical body, is one (1 Cor. xii. 12), compactly and fitly joined together (Eph. iv. 15), it were foolish to say that the mystical body is composed of disjointed and scattered members. Whosoever therefore is not united with the body is no member thereof, neither is he in communion with Christ its head.

Furthermore, in this one Church of Christ no man can be or remain who does not accept, recognize, and obey the authority and supremacy of Peter and his legitimate successors. Did not the ancestors of those who are now entangled in the errors of Photius and of the Reformers obey the Bishop of Rome, the chief shepherd of souls? Their children, alas! have left the home of their fathers; but that house did not therefore fall to the ground and perish for ever, for it was supported by God. Let them, then, return to their Father, Who, forgetting the insults in the past heaped upon the Apostolic See, will accord them a most loving welcome. If, as they constantly say, they long to be united with Us and Ours, why do they not hasten to enter the Church, 'the mother and mistress of all Christ's faithful'? (*Conc. Lateran.*, iv, c. 5). Let them heed the words of Lactantius: 'The Catholic Church is alone in keeping the true worship. This is the fount of truth, this the house of faith, this the temple of God; if any man enter not here, or if any man go forth from it, he is a stranger to the hope of life and salvation. Let none delude himself with obstinate wrangling. For life and salvation are here concerned, and these will be lost for ever unless their interests be carefully and assiduously kept in mind' (*Divin. Inst.* lv. 30, 11-12).

Let our separated children, therefore, draw nigh to the Apostolic See, set up in the City which Peter and Paul, Princes of the Apostles, consecrated by their blood; to the See which is 'the root and womb whence issues the Church of God' (*Cypr. Ep.* 48 *ad Cornelium*, 3); and let them come, not with any intention or hope that 'the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth' (1 Tim. iii. 15) will cast aside the integrity of the faith and tolerate their errors, but to submit themselves to its teaching and government. Would that the happy lot, denied to so many of Our Predecessors, might at last be Ours, to embrace with fatherly affection those children whose unhappy separation from Us

We now deplore. Would that God our Saviour, 'Who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth' (1 Tim. ii. 4), might hear our humble prayer and vouchsafe to recall to the unity of the Church all that are gone astray. To this all-important end We implore, and We desire that others should implore, the intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of divine grace, Help of Christians, victorious over all heresies, that she may entreat for Us the speedy coming of that longed-for day, when all men shall hear the voice of her divine Son, and shall be 'careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace' (Eph. iv. 3).

You, Venerable Brethren, know how dear to Our heart is this desire, and We wish that our children also should know, not only those belonging to the Catholic fold, but also those separated from Us. If these will humbly beg light from heaven, there is no doubt but that they will recognize the one true Church of Jesus Christ, and entering therein, will at last be united with Us in perfect charity. In the hope of this fulfilment, and as a pledge of our fatherly goodwill, We impart most lovingly to you, Venerable Brethren, and to your clergy and people, the Apostolic Benediction.

Given at S. Peter's, Rome, on the 6th day of January, the Feast of the Epiphany of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the year 1928, the sixth of Our Pontificate.

PIUS PP. XI.

III. THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCHES

114. Anglican Ordinations

LETTER TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY FROM THE
ARCHBISHOP OF UTRECHT

(June 1925)

TO THE MOST REVEREND THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF
CANTERBURY, GREETING IN THE LORD.

We are in the happy position of being able to send good news to your Grace. The Old Catholic Church of Utrecht has hitherto been in doubt as to the validity of Anglican Orders. Its doubt concerned, not the fact of Parker's consecration, but the sufficiency of the rite of Edward VI as an adequate expression of the Catholic belief. After long inquiry and serious deliberation, and after consultation with our clergy, we have reached a decision which we hereby communicate to your Grace.

We believe that the Church of England has wished always to maintain the episcopal rule of the Church of antiquity, and that the Edwardine formula of consecration must be accounted valid. We therefore declare, without reservation, that the apostolic succession has not been broken in the Church of England.

Our prayers and greetings in the Lord.

(Signed) ✠ FRANCIS KENNINCK,
Archbishop of Utrecht.

Utrecht, *June 2, 1925.*

115. Anglican Ordinations

LETTER TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF UTRECHT FROM THE
ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

(July 1925)

TO THE MOST REVEREND LORD FRANCIS KENNINCK,
ARCHBISHOP OF UTRECHT, GREETING EVER IN THE LORD,

We have received your Lordship's letter informing us of the decision of the Old Catholic Church of Utrecht on the validity of Anglican Orders. Theologians of learning throughout the world will assuredly be deeply impressed by the fact that your Church, after long, careful, and accurate inquiry, no longer entertains doubt either as to the fact of Parker's consecration or as to the validity of the Edwardine formula of consecration. The same opinion, moreover, has lately been given in various ways by the Orthodox Eastern Church.

For our own part we are sure, and have always been sure, that the apostolical succession has never been broken in the Church of England, and that a valid formula of consecration has been continually maintained; but we give thanks to God for so signally demonstrating His will that His Church, so long rent asunder, should at length return to unity. The Old Catholic Church, which has suffered so much for the truth of the Catholic faith, commands, and has always commanded our veneration; and we rejoice that henceforward no cause of dissension will remain between us on either side, but that we shall be joined in the fellowship of the Word and sacraments as we ever have been in unity of heart.

As regards others, we can confidently say with St. Augustine: 'We are not alarmed about their differences of opinion

because our respect for St. Peter is equal to theirs; but we rejoice that they have remained in the Catholic Church, because we like them are built upon the rock.'

Greetings in our Lord and Saviour.

(Signed) RANDALL CANTUAR :

London, *July* 30, 1925.

IV. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES

FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OF JOINT CONFERENCE HELD AT LAMBETH PALACE, 1921-5

[The Documents which follow are a continuation of Nos. 40-47 in the first portion of this work. The whole series from 1921-5 was published in 1925 by the Oxford University Press, edited by G. K. A. Bell, Dean of Canterbury, and W. L. Robertson, Secretary of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England. A narrative of the proceedings is given in No. 120 below. All the meetings of the Joint Conference, consisting of the two Archbishops and ten Bishops and twenty-five Free Church leaders and its sub-committee were held for the purpose not of negotiation, but of elucidation and explanation. The activities of the Joint Conference were suspended in 1925, 'in order that full opportunity may be given to the Churches represented on the Conference to study and understand the documents already submitted'. Any 'formal pronouncement on any scheme of union or proposals thereon' was deliberately left by the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, 'to the authoritative Assemblies or Courts of the various Churches concerned.'

118. A Memorandum on A Constitutional Episcopate

ADOPTED BY THE JOINT CONFERENCE
JULY 11, 1924

1. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches asked in 1922 among other things for a further elucidation of :

- (i) What is meant by a representative and constitutional episcopate?
- (ii) And how the elements of presbyteral and congregational order may be combined with it?

This topic was discussed by the Sub-Committee in 1922-3, but was laid aside for the moment in favour of another of

the topics requiring elucidation, viz. The Status of Free Church Ministries.

2. The meeting of the Federal Council had before it in 1923 the Report of the Committee on that subject and made its reply thereto. Subsequently it has been possible to take up again the topic which was adjourned before, to discuss it further, and to present the following report upon it.

3. The phrase 'representative and constitutional episcopate' we take to mean an episcopate which is exercised, not apart from, but in conjunction with other forms of ecclesiastical authority, and especially the authority resident in the presbyterate and the yet larger and more fundamental authority that resides in the Church as a whole as guided by the Spirit of God.

4. We agree in holding that Christ as living Head of His Church has given an authority to these jointly and not in isolation one from another. The records of the Early Church and especially the Acts of the Apostles show us this in the working: and it is a recovery of co-operation in fuller measure between the Episcopate, the Presbyterate, and the Body of the Faithful that the Lambeth Appeal wished to see.

5. At the same time the Anglican representatives call attention to the large measure of such co-operation which already exists in the Anglican Communion. It is more easily discerned in the non-established Anglican Churches than in the Church of England itself.

For example, in them the representative character of the Bishop is unmistakable, for he is chosen by the Synod, which itself rests upon the votes of the Clergy and the Church Members.

Again, in such Churches, the Bishop acts 'constitutionally'; for he has no legislative power apart from the Presbyters and the Laity. In his diocesan synod the most that he can do is to withhold his agreement to some decision made by the clergy and laity, and so suspend its

operation until appeal has been made to the final Church Authority.

In the provincial synod he is one among the other Bishops of the Province, and is limited by them.

In administration he is bound by the rules of the Church which defines his personal sphere of action. In discipline the same is the case, and in judicial proceedings he is often restricted constitutionally (as is the Crown) by the action or decision of his own officials. In choosing candidates for the Ministry he must take the call of the Church into account and in ordaining priests he acts with the Presbytery.

Even in England under the Establishment a great deal of this is true: and if the Bishop in England is in some ways less dependent on the co-operation of the faithful, in other respects his freedom of personal action is more circumscribed by the law than is the case with his brother Bishop in non-established Churches of the Anglican Communion.

We are all agreed, therefore, in recognizing the value of conciliar government and we agree that it may take many forms, e.g. synods, presbyteries, assemblies, and the like: and we deprecate the idea that the episcopate should be for the body an exclusive authority alone invested with the privilege and responsibility of government.

Equally we hold that the acceptance of the episcopate need not deprive any Church of any powers of government that it has exercised corporately or through its subordinate authorities, or through the congregations, provided that these powers do not impair the place which we have already¹ recognized as belonging to the Bishop in Ordination.

6. The second question, namely, how the element of presbyteral and congregational order may be combined with

¹ See *Church Unity*, Document No. 44, ii. 7, 8 (*antea*).

the episcopate, invites a restatement of the position showing how far the elements of presbyteral and congregational order may be combined with the episcopate.

The Anglican representatives submit the following statement:

In the Anglican system the presbyterate has its share in all legislation, the House of Clergy has the same suspending power as the Bishop or House of Bishops. Presbyters commonly act with the Bishop in graver matters of discipline; they share in ordination to the presbyterate (as has already been noted): they have their own minor assemblies and officers drawn from their own ranks, such as Archdeacons and Rural Deans, who under the Bishop have some administrative as well as consultative powers.

The congregation is not debarred by any principle in the Anglican system from appointing its own minister. In England this power is seldom operative, but in other parts of the Anglican Church an effective voice is given to the congregation in the choice of its minister. But there is reserved to the Bishop or his deputy the right to institute to a cure of souls. Parochial Church Councils are now the elected and recognized representatives of the congregation, and already large powers and responsibilities have been entrusted to them.

We all agree in the hope that with an episcopate so related to the presbyterate and the congregation the convictions which we severally hold in regard to the nature of the Church and its ministry would be preserved.

7. Desiring, as we all do in the reunited Church of the future, the same spirit of freedom and order, diversity and unity as characterized the Church of Christ in the Apostolic age, and recognizing, as we all do, that the ministry is given by God *to* the Church, yet not *apart* from it, but *through* it, we believe that in the polity of the Church so united, Bishops,

Presbyters or Pastors, and Congregation should be associated as closely with one another in the testimony, worship and service of the Church as their diversity of function by the gift of the same Spirit allows. Recognizing also the continued guidance of the Church by her Head, we all believe that in each of the types of polity which has secured a permanent position in our different communions some element has been preserved which can be of value and service to the whole Church.¹

119. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE ANNUAL ASSEMBLY
SEPTEMBER 16, 1924

The Council receives the Report and thanks the Committee for its work in connexion therewith.

In thus receiving the Report, the Council is not to be held committed (as it was not committed in connexion with former reports) to all the positions taken and the expressions used therein.

The Council appreciates the agreement in the Report that any polity possible for a united Church must combine episcopal, presbyteral and congregational elements, and further the recognition of the 'church' as the seat of 'the larger and more fundamental authority'.

The Council, however, feels that the Anglican position with regard to the method of the recognition of the congregational elements—as distinguished from the episcopal and presbyteral elements—in the polity of a united Church requires further elucidation.

In re-appointing its representatives, the Council thinks

¹ As the Federal Council has definitely referred the question of the relation of Church and State to the Sub-Committee, this question is reserved for further consideration. (See No. 125.)

it opportune, after a third year of the meetings in conference at Lambeth, to express the opinion that it is not in the interests of the unity movement itself that these conferences should be indefinitely prolonged. It suggests that those engaged in conference might at an early suitable opportunity gather together the general results which have been reached and present them for the consideration of the Churches concerned. The Council suggests that judgement on these interim reports should be suspended until some such general statement appears.

The Council, however, in saying this, does not mean to curtail whatever discussion the Committee may think still necessary of points not yet dealt with or completed. In particular the Council feels that the important memorandum presented by the Episcopal members on the subject of the Status of the Free Church Ministry is entitled to, and requires, further examination.

The Council is constrained once more to record its opinion that the discussing of points of unity between the Anglican Church and the Free Churches will always lack something of reality when it is unaccompanied by acts of more definite unity in Christian worship.

With these indications of its mind the Council reappoints its Committee.

120. A Preliminary Statement by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Moderator of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England

JUNE 19, 1925

Five years have passed since the issue of the Appeal to All Christian People by the Lambeth Conference of 1920. During the whole of that time conversations have been held

or Conferences have been taking place between Bishops of the Church of England, and spokesmen of the Free Churches. We think that it may be of interest if, at this stage, in submitting the last of our replies to the questions which we have been asked to consider, we give a brief account of the course of the Proceedings.

The Joint Conference was formed in September 1921, following upon a Report entitled, 'The Free Churches and the Lambeth Appeal', when the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches appointed twenty-five Free Church representatives to confer with the two Archbishops and other members of the Church of England with regard to the Appeal. In May 1922 this Joint Conference published a Joint Report on Church Unity of great importance, consisting of a Preliminary Statement and a series of agreed propositions on 'The Nature of the Church', 'The Ministry', and 'The Place of the Creed in a United Church'. In the following September the Annual Assembly of the Federal Council, with this Joint Report before it, set out five practical difficulties which, in particular, remained to be considered, as follows:

1. What is meant by a 'representative and constitutional' episcopate, and how the elements of presbyteral and congregational order may be combined with it;
2. The Status of the existing Free Church ministry;
3. The relation of the Free Churches to Communion with which they are in fellowship in other parts of the world;
4. The problems connected with the union between Church and State;
5. The safe-guarding of the evangelical principles of the Reformation.

These practical difficulties have been discussed systematically by the Joint Conference, acting in the main through

the Sub-Committee, which has met at regular intervals ever since. In July 1923 the Church of England representatives presented a document of unusual significance in answer to the second of the above questions, entitled 'Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry'. This was received in September 1923 by the Federal Council, which adopted a series of considered Resolutions on the main positions of the document. In the summer of 1924 the Joint Conference issued a further Memorandum dealing with the first of the five questions quoted above, entitled 'Memorandum on a Constitutional Episcopate'. This document was in turn received and considered by the Federal Council in their Autumn Assembly last year. In receiving this Report the Federal Council, while not meaning to curtail discussion, suggested that the Conferences should not be 'indefinitely prolonged', and that those engaged in the discussions might 'at an early suitable opportunity gather together the general results which have been reached and present them for the consideration of the Churches concerned'.

The Joint Conference has this year completed its consideration of all the questions which it was definitely asked to consider, as well as certain points arising out of particular documents in the series. The Memoranda which it accordingly submits to the Federal Council are as follows:

- (1) A Second Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry; together with an Appended Note presented on behalf of the Free Church representatives on the Joint Conference.
- (2) A Memorandum with reference to the question of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, viz. What is meant by a 'representative and constitutional' episcopate, and how the elements of presbyteral and congregational order may be combined with it.

- (3) A Short Memorandum on the relation of the Free Churches to Communion with which they are in fellowship in other parts of the world.
- (4) A Short Memorandum on the problems connected with the union between Church and State.
- (5) A Short Memorandum on the safe-guarding of the evangelical principles of the Reformation.

The Joint Conference believes that the time has now come when there might well be some suspension of its activities in order that full opportunity may be given to the Churches represented on the Conference to study and understand the documents already submitted. Every one of the Churches represented and connected with the Federal Council received a copy of the Appeal, officially transmitted to each by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1920. And it is with the cordial approval of the individual Free Churches that the Federal Council has up to this stage acted on their behalf for the purpose of elucidation and explication, deliberately leaving any 'formal pronouncement on any scheme of union or proposals thereon . . . to the authoritative Assemblies or Courts of the various Churches concerned'.

It is with profound and deliberate thankfulness that in putting forth this Statement, the last probably that we shall issue for the present, we look back along the intercourse, the deliberations, the work and the prayers of these eventful years. In a field of inevitable controversy we have, by the Blessing of God, attained a much larger measure of agreement than was thought by most people to be possible when our Conference began nearly four years ago. Much still remains to be considered, and ample time is required during which the questions we have carefully debated and the provisional conclusions we have reached will afford matter for prayer and thought and converse in the wider circles of our friends at home and overseas.

It is our special hope that the time will be occupied by

a consideration more careful than hitherto of the results of our labours on the part of the various denominations, extending throughout the world, to which the members of our Conference belong. But though for this reason we think that our deliberations ought, for the present, to be suspended, we trust that they will not be regarded as concluded; and, if it is desired, the Joint Conference and the Sub-Committee are willing to hold themselves in readiness at any time to consider any further matters which may be referred to them.

May the Holy Spirit, to whose aid we have looked in our deliberations, vouchsafe to those on whose behalf we have tried to act and speak the wisdom and understanding, the counsel and strength which will make fruitful our contribution to the growth and security of the wider unity for which we pray.

RANDALL CAÑTUAR:

COSMO EBOR:

J. SCOTT LIDGETT, *Moderator of the
Federal Council.*

*121. A Second Memorandum on the Status of the
Existing Free Church Ministry*

PRESENTED ON BEHALF OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
REPRESENTATIVES ON THE JOINT CONFERENCE, TOGETHER
WITH AN APPENDED NOTE FROM THE FREE CHURCH
MEMBERS OF THE JOINT CONFERENCE

JUNE 19, 1925

In a series of resolutions adopted by the Annual Assembly on September 18, 1923, the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England commented on the memorandum on the status of the existing Free Church Ministries prepared by the Anglican representatives of the Joint Con-

ference meeting at Lambeth, and requested its own representatives to confer further on this matter. In the course of these further Conferences, we, the Anglican representatives, were requested to write some rejoinder to these resolutions which could be incorporated with them in the documents of the Joint Conference. In accordance with this request we submit the following Memorandum:

I. It is perhaps well at the outset for the sake of clearness and the prevention of misunderstandings to recall what was said in our first Memorandum, namely, that the Free Church ministries, which we regard as being within their several spheres real ministries in the Universal Church, are such ministries as are in some real measure given and exercised in accordance with the principles set forth in the first report of our Joint Conference.¹

II. Even with regard to such ministries the Resolutions of the Federal Council seem to us to assume too readily that because the Word is admitted to be Christ's Word, and the Sacraments to be Christ's Sacraments, no further questions can rightly be raised as to the sufficiency of the Word preached or the Sacraments administered or of the ministers thereof. But such questions are inevitable.² Can it be claimed of any Word preached, of any Sacrament administered, of any ministry, that it is in perfect accord with Christ's mind and will? There are many grounds and degrees of imperfection. As to these each Church must judge in accordance with its own beliefs about the mind and will of Christ and the guidance of the Holy Spirit. In the exercise of the discipline which is involved in its corporate life, it must needs make decisions as to where it draws the line of allowance or disallowance in regulating its own practice or estimating the practice of others. It cannot accept a mere intention, however sincere, to preach the Word as Christ's

¹ See *Church Unity*, Document No. 44 (*antea*).

² See Document No. 44, The Report, I. 10 and II. 7.

Word, or to administer the Sacraments as Christ's Sacraments as sufficient without any further questions. It must guard the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments for the sake of its own members, and in loyalty to its own conception of truth. Thus in our judgement it does not follow that because certain ministries are admitted to be real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments, they must thereby be considered as in themselves sufficient.

III. These considerations affect the question of the authority of the ministry. Spiritual efficacy is one thing, due authority is another. The latter is not involved in the former. The full admission which we have most readily made in accordance with the spirit and terms of the Lambeth Appeal to all Christian people, that the ministries we are considering possess spiritual reality and efficacy, does not carry with it the admission that they have due authority. And this matter of due authority is to us one of the highest importance. We rejoice that in the first report of our Conference all its members unanimously agreed that the episcopate should be accepted for the united Church of the future, as the means whereby the authority to the whole body should be given to the ministry. But we regard this bestowal of the authority of the whole body to the Ministry by Episcopal Ordination not merely as something which is desirable for the united Church of the future, but as something which 'from the Apostles' time' has always been provided for the Church. We see in this provision a token of the guidance of the Church by the Holy Spirit and of the Divine purpose. We regard the acceptance of it as a trust to which the Anglican Church is called to be faithful. We believe that the refusal of it, however natural at certain periods of Church history, has been responsible for many of the divisions of Christendom in the past, and that indifference to it ought not to mark any steps which may be taken in

the endeavour to restore the broken unity of the Church in the future.

IV. It is true, as the resolutions of the Federal Council point out, that in the confused times of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries exceptions to the rule requiring Episcopal Ordination for Ministry in the Church of England sometimes occurred. But the Resolutions admit that these cases were exceptional. They form a very insecure basis of precedent. And it must be remembered that the aim of our present conferences arising, as they do, out of the Lambeth Appeal is different from, and wider than, the aim of arrangements which may sometimes have been made to meet the difficulties of troubled times in the past history of the Church of England. For our endeavour is not merely to meet difficulties and restore unity in our own country, but to do this in such a way as may form a basis for still wider union throughout the world. However remote the attainment of such an ideal may seem, we are responsible for seeing that nothing which we do now will create a new obstacle to that attainment.

V. Here, then, we reach the heart of the problem which confronts us. On the one hand the Anglican Church requires that no one can exercise his ministry in its own congregations who has not received Episcopal Ordination. On the other hand, many—it may be most—of our Free Church brethren would be unwilling not only to receive such Ordination, but also to promote any scheme of union which required it. Is the mere statement of the difficulty the last word that can be said about it? We who represent the Anglican Church in this Conference feel ourselves to be under a constraint, both of mind and heart, to do all we can to overcome it consistently with loyalty to our principles and to our ideals of Christian unity.

VI. Before going further we think it well to call attention to the narrow limits within which so far as our own dis-

cussions are concerned the difficulty will exist. We do so not for the sake of those who have taken part in these discussions, but for the sake of the wider public who may read the records of them. It must be remembered that in these conferences we are not dealing with Free Churchmen who reject the whole idea of Episcopal Ordination. On the contrary, our Free Church colleagues have agreed with us that while the elements of Presbyteral and Congregational Order should be maintained with a representative and constitutional Episcopate as permanent elements in the order and life of the united Church of the future, the Episcopate ought to be accepted as the means whereby the authority of the whole body shall be given to the Ministry.¹ The difficulty would occur only as to the position of existing Free Church ministries within the period between the adoption of a scheme of union and its completion by all the ministers of the uniting Churches possessing a common authority through Episcopal Ordination.

VII. The question which we desire to consider, and which we desire the Church to which we belong to consider, is whether within that period some modification may be possible of the present requirement of full and unconditional Episcopal Ordination. It will be understood that any suggestions which we, who present this Memorandum, venture to make are made solely on our own responsibility. They are made without authority, most tentatively, and only in order that (to use a prevalent mode of speech) every approach to a solution may be explored. We note first the words of the Lambeth Conference Committee on Reunion already quoted in our former Memorandum, that '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'. We note secondly that the Lambeth Appeal expresses the hope that in such an event

¹ See Document No. 44, The Report, II. 8; cf. II. 9.

ministers who have not received it would accept 'a commission through Episcopal Ordination', and adds that in so doing no one could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry, but would only be publicly and formally seeking additional recognition of a new call to wider service in the reunited Church. Is there any way by which such a commission through Episcopal Ordination could be given, and by which, at the same time, the understanding that no repudiation of past ministries was involved could be made plain? We venture to offer two suggestions for the consideration of the Anglican Church and of the Free Churches represented in the Federal Council.

VIII. (1) Inasmuch as the main stress of the Lambeth Appeal is laid on securing due authority for the ministry, and inasmuch as the lack of this authority is, in our judgement, the main defect in the Free Church ministries which we are considering, we ask, might not a solemn authorization be conferred by the laying on of hands by a Bishop? It might be prefaced by explanatory words, by prayer, and the invocation of the Holy Spirit, and it might be expressed in some such form as this: 'Take thou Authority, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands, for the office and work of a Priest (or Presbyter). And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of his Holy Sacraments; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.' We believe that such a proposal would commend itself to many of our Free Church brethren, and we think it is worthy of the careful consideration of our own Church.

But we cannot deny that it is open to many serious objections. There would be some doubt as to the exact nature of the authority which was conferred, whether it was an authority of order or only of jurisdiction. There would be the disadvantage of a solemn formula being used in a wider sense by those who spoke it, and in a more

restricted sense by those over whom it was spoken. Any ambiguity might give rise to hesitation and misgiving in the minds of many faithful members of the Anglican Church, and thereby hinder the cordial acceptance of the authority thus conferred. Its sufficiency might be questioned by other Episcopal Churches. We think that a second plan which we venture to suggest would be less open to such objections.

IX. (2) It is Ordination *sub conditione*—an act of Episcopal Ordination prefaced and governed by a condition expressed in some such words as ‘If thou art not already Ordained’. These words would be followed by the form of Ordination and Authorization in the Ordinal of the Church of England. But the whole of the service therein set forth need not be used. There would simply be an act supplementing the existing ministries by the essentials of Ordination, and this *sub conditione*. It seems to us that this plan would have the merit of dealing straightforwardly with the actual facts of the situation. It would recognize, as a matter of fact, that there *is* a doubt on one side; it would not require or involve any acknowledgement of the validity of that doubt from the other side. It would be following a practice which has long been familiar in the Church with regard to the Sacrament of Baptism. Where there is a doubt as to the evidence of the fact of Baptism, or as to the use of the essential parts (baptism with water and in the name of the Holy Trinity) the Sacrament need not be reiterated but may be administered conditionally. The same practice, though less commonly, has been used with regard to Ordination. There are precedents for it in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference recommend its use in certain cases even of Episcopal Ordination.

This plan would not, we think, be open to the objections which we felt bound to mention with regard to the first

plan submitted for consideration. There would be no ambiguity as to its purpose. The person thus conditionally Ordained would simply, we repeat, be acknowledging as a fact the existence of a doubt in the mind of the Ordaining authority without necessarily implying that he himself admitted its validity. The Ordaining authority would simply give whatever in its judgement had hitherto been wanting. Any discrimination between the circumstances of the previous Ordination of this or that particular minister would be unnecessary. All would be treated in the same way. There would be more probability of the Ordination being confidently accepted by all members of the Anglican Church, and of other Episcopal Churches.

X. If either of these suggestions were adopted, then the present invariable requirement of the Anglican Church that those who have not received Episcopal Ordination must be Ordained *simpliciter*, without any condition, would be suspended during the period which we are considering. It would be for the United Church to make its own regulations for the future. Our Free Church brethren will recognize that this involves a very real change in the practice of the Anglican Church. We do not know whether it would be sanctioned by the authorities of that Church. But we who present this Memorandum believe that the suggestions we have ventured to make, especially the second, are not inconsistent with the principles, history, or position in Christendom of the Anglican Church. The Resolutions of the Federal Council say: 'The question of Ordination is the place where we look to the Anglican Church to meet their Free Church brethren'. In these suggestions we have gone as far as we rightly can go to meet them. We hope that they will regard them in the same spirit. We ask both the Anglican Church and the Free Churches to consider whether they may not form a bridge between two apparently opposed positions. With the Federal Council 'we ask no immediate

or premature answer. We believe that God's guidance of us all in this matter has not ended.' We pray that the Holy Spirit of truth and unity who has already—as we humbly believe—led us to a measure of agreement which once would have seemed impossible may continue to guide our hearts and minds.

APPENDED NOTE

FROM THE FREE CHURCH MEMBERS OF THE JOINT CONFERENCE

We have now had fuller opportunity of considering this important Memorandum, which we have done with respect and care, and we desire to make the following *interim* statement regarding it.

1. We heartily appreciate the spirit in which the Memorandum is written and we receive it as an expression of a sincere desire on the part of the Anglican members of the Joint Conference to make an advance towards meeting their Free Church brethren on the difficult and crucial issue, which from the very beginning of these negotiations we have regarded as primary and vital.
2. It is not within our present responsibility to pass judgement, in the name of the Free Churches, upon the alternative suggestions made in the Memorandum, nor is it desirable that we should attempt to do so. These suggestions must be considered in due course by the Federal Council. Meantime, they should be studied not with the view of immediate acceptance or rejection, but with the earnest desire to explore all possible ways by which this problem can be met, with due regard alike to the ecclesiastical principle and to the practical situation on either side.

3. Noting, however, as we do, the preference given in the Memorandum to the proposal of 'Ordination *sub conditione*', we feel that it would be less than candid if we did not say that, whatever may be the view taken of this by individuals among us, we are unable to hold out to our Anglican brethren any prospect of its being found adequate or acceptable by the Federal Council or by the Free Churches. We say this solely that our brethren may be under no misapprehension as to the situation.
4. For our own part, we feel that the solution of this question might be sought along lines which (a) confer an 'extended commission' mutually and not from one side only, and (b) indicate unambiguously an 'extended commission' and not an ordination. This is also the view which has been maintained in negotiations over the Lambeth Appeal in Canada and India (*vide* Dean Bell's *Documents on Christian Unity*,¹ pp. 263-7, 312-17). We record this because, as we have said, every possible way of meeting the problem should be before the minds of all of us.
5. We venture to think that it is not advisable that the Sub-Committee should immediately pursue the discussion of these or any other proposals in this matter to an issue; and we take it from the closing words of the Memorandum that this is also the view of our Anglican brethren. We engage to continue to give their suggestions full and careful consideration and to secure such consideration for them by those whom we represent. We believe that God, who has led us through so many difficulties up to now, will still guide us if we are faithful to the Spirit alike of Truth and of Charity.

¹ 1920-24: not included in the present volume.

122. A Memorandum by the Bishop of Truro and the Rev. A. E. Garvie, D.D., with reference to the question, 'What is meant by a Representative and Constitutional Episcopate, and how the Elements of Presbyteral and Congregational Order may be combined with it'

GENERALLY APPROVED BY THE JOINT CONFERENCE¹

JUNE 19, 1925

I. The Conference has already expressed its agreement that a non-episcopal Church in accepting episcopacy 'might retain a very large measure of self-government according to its previous methods', and in the Memorandum of July 11, 1924, we attempted to show how the acceptance of the episcopate might be combined with the elements of presbyteral and congregational order. We now desire to venture a step further with some more detailed suggestions as to the possible working of a scheme for a group of Churches uniting on such lines. The way was marked out in the Lambeth Appeal, where it spoke first of 'Terms of Union' to be settled at the outset, and then of a procedure with regard to the ministry. Two alternative methods for this have been set out in the Anglican Memorandum of June 19, 1925,² and now, assuming some such method as adopted, we can pass on to forecast in outline the subsequent working out of it, presumably in an *interim* period (of longer or shorter length), which will be necessary before the uniting churches can be ready to attain to the ultimate goal of organic reunion.

Such forecasting is hazardous work; but we seem to have reached the point where imagination may legitimately lend its aid to faith and hope: and where we may meet the

¹ This 'forecast in outline' was not formally adopted by the Joint Conference, but sent forward to the Federal Council with its general approval.—*Ed.*

² No. 121, p. 213 *antea*.

common objection, 'The thing is unworkable—inconceivable!' by saying, 'Why should it not conceivably work out somewhat as follows?'

II. Each non-episcopal denomination, when it had decided through its own proper authorities to come into the scheme, would itself choose those whom, as its representatives, it desired to have consecrated as bishops. These would be presented for acceptance to the Metropolitan of the Anglican province concerned, and he, acting with his comprovincial bishops, would consecrate them direct to the episcopate, using either the Anglican rite or some other form which had been adopted as an alternative to it for use in the Uniting Churches.

III. The method by which the candidates for consecration were chosen would be left for decision to each denomination, provided that it was made clear that the call of the Church to the man and his own inner sense of call coincided in making plain the call of God.

IV. Each bishop so consecrated would exercise authority only over those ministers and congregations of his own denomination which were assigned to him by it, and under such conditions as it should determine. For convenience sake, it would be well if (in England at least) the assignment should be made on territorial lines, and should take account of the existing territorial areas of the Anglican provinces and dioceses.

Each bishop, whether taking charge of an Anglican or a Free Church group, would have no immediate jurisdiction over those of another group, but only such authority as the bishop in charge of it might delegate to him; and in any important matter it would be advisable that this should be done formally by a definite Commission.

V. After this consecration the new bishop, associated with presbyters and other ministers, would offer to the ministers of his jurisdiction an opportunity of supplementing the

ordination that had been previously conferred on each of them by receiving in some brief form a 'conditional ordination', or whatever other equivalent may be agreed upon, as the way of 'obtaining for them a ministry (accepted) throughout the whole fellowship'.

Each man who availed himself of that opportunity would be welcomed to minister the Word and Sacraments in all Churches and congregations of the uniting denominations, when licensed to do so both by the bishop of his own denomination and by the bishop of those to whom he ministered.

Those who did not avail themselves of such opportunities (during the period in which, by agreement, they were offered) would not have the right to administer the Holy Communion to Anglican congregations, nor yet to those of any other denomination unless it is decided otherwise. But they should have full right, as being ministers of one or other of the uniting denominations, to conduct other services, and to preach, in other churches than their own, if licensed thereto by the bishop of the church in question.

All those episcopally ordained, whether before the scheme or after it, or else *sub conditione* during the inauguration of the scheme, would equally be entitled to receive a call or appointment to any charge or cure within any of the united Churches; but if he were to be transferred from one of them to another, a permission from the bishop of each church concerned would be necessary for the transference.

VI. Having dealt thus in outline with the first steps of the uniting Churches, we come now to forecast the continuous working of the scheme during the *interim* period, and the co-ordination of the different church polities of the uniting Churches under one central assembly.

We envisage the situation somewhat as follows: Each parish, local church, or congregation would form part of an administrative unit over which a bishop would preside.

Areas would be arranged so that each unit had its own local boundaries, but everywhere there would be several co-existing jurisdictions—Anglican, Wesleyan, Congregationalist, and so forth. As far as possible the local boundaries should coincide, e.g. a county such as Somersetshire, Cornwall or Durham would easily form not only an Anglican diocese (as at present) but also an area common to three or four Free Church bishops, presiding each over his own denomination therein.

Each unit then would be in threefold connexion with other units: (*a*) denominationally, i.e. with the other units of its own denomination; (*b*) territorially, i.e. with the other denominations of its own region or area; (*c*) centrally, with all other units grouped together in a central assembly, which would cover whatever comprehensive region was found to be most manageable, such as, for example, a country, a Dominion, a colony, a mission field, or the like.

VII. (*c*) We may look a little more closely in turn, but in reverse order, at each of these. The new Central Assembly ought to be fully representative of bishops, clergy, and laity of all the uniting Churches. It is probable that it should have more than a consultative authority. It should be able to legislate on behalf of the whole group of uniting Churches. But due provision should be made that, in legislating, the constituent Churches, as well as each House—bishops, clergy, and laity—should vote separately. Legislation should only be effected by the requisite majority of each House and of each constituent Church. Also it would be best that for any change in the original Terms of Union, either by alteration or addition, a bare majority should not be sufficient.

The Central Assembly should also act as a Court of Appeal or Arbitration upon any matters referred to it, either by one of the denominational assemblies, or by one of the regional councils.

The details would need to be worked out with great care ;

but, for the purposes of this very slender sketch, it is enough to say that the Central Assembly should include all the bishops, together with a full and proportionate representation of the clergy and laity of all the constituent Churches.

The ministers of all the uniting denominations should be recognized as of equal status in all councils and assemblies of the uniting Churches, including those not episcopally ordained.

VIII. (b) It is in the regional areas that the clash of jurisdictions will be most felt; and there plans must be devised for harmonious working. History provides very little precedent for several concurrent, co-extensive, and co-operating episcopal jurisdictions. Normally the rule has prevailed, 'One area, one bishop'; and the emergence of two bishops of the same area has meant schism, or, at least, rivalry. But this problem might be solved by recognizing that each of the bishops in the area had authority over persons and congregations, rather than over the area itself. At the same time, the bishops of the area, acting collectively as a college, might in some matters come to exercise a joint supervision extending over all the congregations contained in it.

And happily there are some precedents for such a plan, at least, as an *interim* measure, and leading up to the recovery of the old rule of 'One area, one bishop', on which orderliness must ultimately depend in any episcopally led Church. The healing of the Donatist schism in Africa, for example, was brought about through tolerating the co-existence of two bishops and two jurisdictions in one area, until such time as all the congregations could agree to coalesce under one.

Meanwhile, the regional Councils would present great opportunities for organizing common work, for reducing the waste caused by undesirable competition, for effecting economy, or better distribution of man-power both in home

work and overseas; and, more important than all, for recovering the spirit of fellowship, and manifesting afresh to the world the solid Christian witness of a United Church.

All this would show itself in practical comity with regard to evangelistic and pastoral work as well as in ministrations to special classes. It would also conduce to the settlement of difficult questions, educational, social, and moral, affecting the public life of the community.

Any interdenominational question or dispute could be settled by the regional Council, which should be a local counterpart of the Central Assembly, and if settlement were not satisfactorily reached there, it would go up to the Central Assembly for decision.

IX. (a) The organization of the different denominational units in their one common denomination need not differ, we suppose, from what already exists, except in so far as it is modified by the acceptance of the Terms of Union. The powers of the bishop need not be identical in different denominations, except in so far as the Terms of Union may reserve some functions to the bishop, notably ordination and probably confirmation. The same variety would be kept as to the choice and call of a man into the ministry, the minister's appointment to a particular charge or cure, or his removal from it. To the minister probably would be reserved by the Terms of Union, the administration of Holy Communion, and (except in case of urgency) of Holy Baptism, and the official act of absolving and blessing in the Church's name. But otherwise his action would be regulated by the denominational authorities whatever they might be.

X. It may be anticipated that the uniting denominations would during this interim period retain their financial independence, and their present arrangements as to buildings, property, and the like. In course of time some transference of clergy and ministers might entail some readjust-

ments, and some transference of buildings might involve some variation of trusts ; but we do not anticipate that these matters would be difficult. Any joint handling of financial questions could thus be deferred till a later stage, as common life in one communion brought the constituent bodies closer to one another, and disseminated not only the brotherly spirit, but also the businesslike knowledge needed for any further stages of financial unification.

In other respects, too, the ancient customs of the denomination would prevail. Three points may be specially mentioned by way of example:

The foreign relations of each denomination would remain as they are: each would have power to remain in communion with other Churches lying outside the scheme at its own discretion. But this would not bind the others. They would decide also, each on its own responsibility; and intercommunion with one would not imply intercommunion with all. The freedom in worship of each denomination would be retained—subject only to such restrictions as the Terms of Union might entail. The laity would not be very directly touched by any of the developments here outlined: their position, privileges, and duties would be conserved. They would remain under the discipline of their own denomination.

XI. This outline has in view mainly the English problem of the reunion of the English Church with the English Evangelical Churches which are represented in our Lambeth meetings. But the wider problem of the position overseas and of the missionary areas has not been left altogether out of sight: nor must the oecumenical aspect of Reunion be forgotten if we would be faithful to the purpose of our Saviour.

But for the moment this very tentative Memorandum will provide more than enough for consideration and discussion.

123. A Short Memorandum on the Relation of the Free Churches to Communion with which they are in Fellowship in other parts of the World

ADOPTED BY THE JOINT CONFERENCE

JUNE 19, 1925

We have contemplated that after preliminary negotiations have been completed between Churches desiring to enter into closer union there would be a period, short or long, during which each Church would retain a large measure of distinctiveness in its life and government. During this period it may be assumed that the relations between each Church and other Churches in other parts of the world would continue to be much as they are now. Any arrangements which one or more of the Free Churches in England might make as to the adoption of the Episcopate in the manner suggested in the memorandum on that subject would probably not be regarded by Churches elsewhere as disturbing their existing communion. If any questions arose—for example, as to the admission of ministers or members from other Churches—which were likely to cause difficulties in the fellowship of the uniting Churches, they would, it is assumed, be referred for settlement to the Central Council of these uniting Churches which we have had in view.

If this period were to issue in closer and organic union, questions as to the relation between the United Church and other Churches hitherto in communion with its constituent parts would be determined by the final terms of union.

A situation would then have been reached so different from that which now exists, that it would seem to be premature to attempt now to forecast what arrangements might then be made.

124. A Short Memorandum on the Problems connected with the Union between Church and State

ADOPTED BY THE JOINT CONFERENCE

JUNE 19, 1925

The discussions at the meetings of the Conference and of the Sub-Committee have dealt particularly with outstanding questions that concern the relations between the Episcopal and the non-Episcopal Churches, and it has been impossible to enter fully into the questions that affect the relations of the Church to the State. Nor indeed is it possible to deal fully at the present time with a situation that is constantly changing. At the time of reunion it is clear that many problems would arise both in the ecclesiastical and in the civil spheres, and would have to be settled severally by the uniting Churches and the State, none of the Churches represented in the present Conferences being committed now to any particular solution.

I. From the Free Church point of view it may be said—
Two guiding principles it seems possible now to lay down:

- (1) That the Church should enjoy complete autonomy in the discharge of all its spiritual functions.
- (2) That the Church should be free to bring its highest and utmost possible influence to the service of the State in promoting the well-being of the people, and in bearing its witness to the authority of Christian principles in the affairs of the State.

II. From the Anglican point of view it may be said:

- (1) The relations between the Church of England and the State have been and are being greatly modified by the system inaugurated by the Enabling Act. It is possible that in regard to Ecclesiastical Courts proposals may be adopted which would more fully safeguard the spiritual authority of the Church.

- (2) Many Churches of the Anglican Communion have now no special connexion with the State.
- (3) No member of the Church of England would regard what is called 'Establishment' as involving any principle essential to the life of the Church.

Those who value 'Establishment'—for the sake of the Church as giving it a special association with and responsibility for the life of the English nation, for the sake of the State as expressing its religious character—would probably be unwilling to bring it to an end for the sake of any union with some of their fellow Christians in England, which would only be very partial as regards either its scope or the numbers involved. Their view would certainly be greatly affected if there were the prospect of any really large or permanent union.

Thus, suppose one of the Free Churches in England entered into negotiations with the Church of England with a view to a new spiritual fellowship, and during what we have in these discussions called the interim period (when each Church would retain much of its own distinctive life and government) the Church of England desired to retain its connexion with the State, it might be hoped that the Free Church would not regard this as a bar to the spiritual fellowship desired.

Suppose this period resulted in a wish for a full organic union, then the question of relationship with the State would be determined by the final terms of union. If the union thus contemplated embraced a large majority of English Christians, then on the one hand the Church of England might be unwilling to press the continuance of its 'Establishment', if this proved to be a fatal obstacle to union; and on the other hand the Free Churches might be willing to reconsider their attitude in view of the prospect of a really national Church, and the State on its part might be willing to alter the character and incidents of Establish-

ment. Here again a new situation would arise wholly different from the present, which would make a reconsideration of the problem on all sides possible and indeed inevitable.

125. A Short Memorandum on the Safeguarding of the Evangelical Principles of the Reformation

ADOPTED BY THE JOINT CONFERENCE
JUNE 19, 1925

While this question is one of very great importance, it does not seem to us that it can be profitably considered at the present stage of our discussions. The primary object of our Conferences has been to consider together the Appeal of the Lambeth Conference to All Christian People with a view to the elucidation of what it says and what it involves. In that Appeal the Conference was content to suggest a threefold basis on which a United Church might be built up. This threefold basis was:

‘The whole-hearted acceptance of:

- (1) ‘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:
- (2) ‘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:
- (3) ‘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.’

It is on this basis that the present Conferences have been carried on, and we for our part cannot contemplate any further discussions dealing with doctrine or ceremony which would not be on the same basis.

*126. The Federal Council of the Evangelical
Free Churches of England*

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE ANNUAL ASSEMBLY
SEPTEMBER 21-3, 1925

I

The Council receives the Report, without thereby being committed, any more than in previous years, to all the statements and opinions contained therein. In so doing, it thanks the Anglican representatives on the Joint Committee for the care, conciliation, and candour with which they have considered and replied to the questions submitted on behalf of the Free Churches.

II

The Council concurs in the opinion given in the Report, and approved by the Anglican representatives and its own, that it is desirable to bring to a pause the conferences which have been taking place, in order that the various documents issued by the Joint Committee and the positions agreed on or proposed may be more deliberately considered by the Churches concerned and by the Christian mind of the country. In concurring in this, the Council expresses its deep thankfulness for the spirit of unbroken friendliness which has prevailed throughout the whole proceedings of the Joint Committee for four years; and it desires to make clear that such suspension of formal meetings at Lambeth is not to be taken to mean any rupture in this friendly relationship, or any closing of the door against the resump-

tion of conference when God's Spirit may seem to invite to this step.

III

In view of the termination of the present series of conferences the Council discharges the Committee. It resolves to appoint a Committee of Reference on the Lambeth Appeal (to be nominated by the Standing Committee) to elucidate any points of inquiry which may arise, and generally to watch over the situation, but without power to resume formal conference till so authorized by the Council.

IV

In view, further, of the termination of these conferences, the Council, for the information of the Churches which it represents, may fitly at this stage recall and briefly comment on the main positions regarding faith and order which have been explored by the Joint Committee. It will suffice to mention, at present, four topics:

(i) The large measure of agreement between the Churches concerned on vital and fundamental matters of *faith* is to be recognized, valued, and emphasized. On the strength of this alone, the Free Churches declare their readiness to join with their Anglican brethren not only in moral and social, but also in religious and evangelical work wherever possible.

(ii) On the issue of *polity*, the Joint Committee was agreed that an episcopacy, not of its present character, but of a 'constitutional' character, should be an essential element in the order of the United Church, place being 'similarly' given to elements of presbyteral and congregational order as equally essential elements; and this proposal is to be taken not in one part of it only, but in its entirety. Suggestions as to how a 'constitutional episcopate' can be reconciled with the presbyteral and congregational elements are made in memoranda accompanying this Report,

but it is important to notice that neither the Joint Committee nor the Council is committed to these details.

(iii) On the matter of *recognition*, regarding which the Free Church representatives have from the first meeting at Lambeth desired some declaration of the Anglican view, special note should be taken of the following statement made by the Anglican representatives in their first memorandum on the 'Status of the Free Church Ministry':

'It seems to us to be in accord with the Lambeth Appeal to say, as we are prepared to say, that the ministries which we have in view in this memorandum, ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Churches concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church.' (Dean Bell's *Documents on Christian Unity*, p. 159.)¹

This explicit and considered recognition of these non-episcopally ordained ministries as (a) evangelical, (b) sacramental, and (c) not schismatic but within the Church—whatever further questions as to the extent of their 'authorization' may be subsequently raised—is to be welcomed; and, if its significance is fully recognized, and if practical effect is given to its terms, it should mark a stage in the whole discussion between the Anglican and the Free Churches, and will prove a valuable basis for further progress if and when conferences are resumed.

(iv) It must, however, be observed that, on this subsequent question of *authorization* the Anglican representatives seem still inclined, despite the declaration above quoted, to insist that Free Church ministers accept ordination—at least in the form known as *sub conditione*—at episcopal hands. The Free Church representatives on the Joint Committee intimated that there is, in their view, little or no

¹ See Document No. 46, *antea*.

prospect of this being accepted by any non-episcopal Church. With this view the Council agrees; and it takes leave to say that it would deeply regret if the fortunes of the Lambeth Appeal, so far as non-episcopal Christendom is concerned, were finally bound up with a proposal so unconvincing and so unpromising as that of requiring the ordination to the ministry of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Church of men explicitly acknowledged to be in that very ministry. The question of authorization must be answered by some other means than ordination. It is, therefore, to be noted with satisfaction that the Anglican memorandum does not exclude the alternative method of a 'commission' which shall be (a) mutual and (b) unambiguously not an ordination. This is the line which is being followed wherever to-day union between Churches is being achieved. It should, however, be recognized that on this question the Anglican Church has peculiar difficulties to consider; and the issue is one which, therefore, is not to be pressed to an immediate decision. (There are other matters of high importance in the report and its accompanying memoranda, but these, having been less fully dealt with, need not be referred to here.)

V

In conclusion, the Council, reviewing the whole of the conversations which have taken place—which have been carried on for a much longer period and in a far more conciliatory spirit than in any previous meetings between Conformity and Nonconformity in England—records its assurance that these conferences have done much to bring representative members of the Churches concerned into closer fellowship and to a better understanding of each other's position; and, further, that they have prepared the way to further progress towards unity in the future. To avoid any misunderstanding, it may be well to state that

the discussions have been in no sense negotiations for reunion, but have been intended simply to elucidate the meaning of the Lambeth Appeal and to indicate on what lines reunion, if desired, might possibly be effected. Believing that the Spirit of God is, in these days, manifestly drawing more closely together all who name the Name of Christ as Lord and Saviour, and impressed with the urgent call to unity in face of the moral and religious problems of the world, the Council anew commends the whole matter to the mind and heart and conscience of Christian people, particularly the people of the Churches which it represents. And it prays that grace and mercy and peace from our Lord Jesus Christ may be with the brethren with whom it has been in conference, with the great Church which they represent, and with the whole Church of God.

V. THE MORAVIAN CHURCH

[Communications have taken place between the Church of England and the Moravian Church (*Unitas Fratrum*) over a considerable period, and the question of reciprocity in ministrations was brought before the Lambeth Conference of 1878. The Lambeth Conference of 1908 passed some important Resolutions as a result of the report of a special committee on the orders of the *Unitas*. Negotiations began, but were suspended in 1914. Following the Lambeth Conference of 1920 certain Anglican representatives under the chairmanship of Dr. E. C. S. Gibson, Bishop of Gloucester, conferred and corresponded with Moravian representatives under the chairmanship of Bishop H. R. Mumford. The series of communications closed in 1924 in the circumstances described in the final documents. For convenience Resolutions 70-3 of the Lambeth Conference 1908 are given below:

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE 1908

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*.]

132. A Memorandum from the Moravian Committee on certain points raised by the Lambeth Resolutions 1920

FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE ARCHBISHOP'S
COMMITTEE, DECEMBER 31, 1920

The Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference having reference to the proposed intercommunion with the Moravian Church in the British Province,¹ have been considered by the Moravian Committee, consisting of the Bishops and the Board of Provincial Elders of the said Province.

Our Committee begs* to submit for the consideration of the Anglican Committee the following expression of opinion on what we look upon as very important matters.

It will be more convenient to take each point separately.

- I. *Resolution 70, ii b—Lambeth Conference 1908.* 'Willing to explain its position as that of a religious community or missionary body in close alliance with the Anglican Church.'

In correspondence the position has been illustrated by reference to the Franciscans in the Middle Ages. (See Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to Bishop Hasse, April 7, 1909.) There may be certain features in the origin and tendency of our earliest work in this country which suggest the parallel. Since that time,

¹ See Document No. 2 *supra*, Resolutions 29, 30.

however, we have become settled in this country as a branch of an International Church, with its organized congregations and system of Church Government. Throughout the world we are known, not as a religious 'order', but as a *Church*, in the same sense as the term is used in reference to other Churches. We would therefore submit the following points:

- (a) We dare not ignore or hide that while we in a certain sense might speak of ourselves as a 'missionary body', in the consciousness of our people we are much more, namely, a Church of ancient lineage, and not merely an order within a Church. It would be quite unreal to describe ourselves as an order; were we thus to describe ourselves the question might indeed be asked, what Church is it in the midst of which we minister?
- (b) We claim, and ever have enjoyed, the freedom to assert ourselves as a Church, when permitted by the law of the land, and when led to do so, and it is in this way that we have become an International Community or International Church.
- (c) To describe ourselves officially and deliberately as the Resolution suggests, would be by our own act to reduce permanently our ecclesiastical position, and to become less in this country than in any other country to which, in the providence of God, we have been sent.
- (d) To enter into an alliance with the Anglican Communion on such terms would mean an acknowledgement by us that we are incorporated in the Anglican Communion, derive our status in this country from the Anglican Authorities, and are ultimately under their rule, however lenient and benevolent that rule might be. In support of our position we would refer you to Resolution of our General Synod 1909. '(3) We regard our position as that of an independent branch of the Church Catholic.'

We feel we could not recommend to Synod such an agreement with any prospect of obtaining its confirmation. To us there exists only one basis, namely, the full mutual recognition of two independent Churches, working together on lines agreeable to both. We do not think a way to that end will be found through the loss or reduction of our present status among the Churches.

II. *Resolution 70, ii c—Lambeth Conference 1908.*

Here also it seems to us that the 'due recognition' required from us may be interpreted as exceeding what we, and the Synod as the custodian of the liberty and rights of our Church, could be expected, or are entitled to accord.

Whilst we should be quite prepared for the fullest exchange of views and friendly consultation with the Anglican authorities as circumstances indicate, we feel that ministers of the Moravian Church, when acting within the sphere of their own Church, cannot be under jurisdiction of Anglican bishops. When ministering in any place which is under Anglican authority they would, as a matter of course, be under the jurisdiction of the Anglican bishop—just as any Anglican clergyman would be under the jurisdiction of our Provincial Board when ministering in a place belonging to our Church.

If *Clause ii c* should be interpreted to mean that Moravian ministers would be under the jurisdiction of the Anglican bishops, otherwise than as above provided for, in our opinion this would expose us to grave dangers. It is possible to conceive of Anglican clergymen, or even bishops, who are not sympathetic towards our work, and whose action might jeopardize it in their districts. We therefore feel the need of very definite authoritative explanations and guarantees as to the meaning of this clause.

Any mistake on this point of jurisdiction would at once put us in a position inferior to other Free Churches, and,

moreover, we do not think that the cause of a much wider union, which we all have at heart, would be well served if the first example of what such a Union implies were to demonstrate that the supremacy of the Anglican authorities is essential, involving, as it seems to do, the loss of free movement and development on the part of the Churches which join the Union. We are persuaded that on such terms the Free Churches would find it very difficult, or impossible, to come into union with the Anglican Church.

III. *Resolution 70 i—Lambeth Conference 1908.*

It was agreed by both Committees in the year 1912, that joint consecrations by bishops of both Churches should be a first outward and visible sign of our intercommunion, and to this we again express our assent.

IV. *Resolution 70, ii d—Lambeth Conference 1908.*

In the Report of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference 1920, the following occurs: '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 is distinctly laid down that authority for such action on the part of Presbyters was directly delegated to them by the Bishop, there being precedents for this in East and West.'

We find no Resolution of the Lambeth Conference confirming this, but should your Committee and the Central Consultative Body confirm it, we are prepared to recommend to our Provincial Synod that authority to confirm be given to Presbyters at their ordination.

V. *Deacons presiding at the celebration of Holy Communion.*

Although we do not deny the principle on which we have hitherto acted, of conferring upon deacons the right

to administer the sacraments, for the sake of unity we are prepared to recommend to Synod that the celebration of the Holy Communion in the congregations be restricted to bishops and presbyters.

Before closing this expression of our opinion it seems but fair in candour to add, that following the traditional belief of our Church, we do not give the first place to, nor regard as absolutely essential to mutual recognition between the Churches, any change in our ecclesiastical practice, for in our opinion mutual recognition arises out of considerations of a very different order.

In thus expressing our views, it is, however, and always has been, far from our purpose to convey the impression of any desire on our part to restrict our relations to intercommunion in the more limited sense, i. e. freedom to administer the Holy Communion by accredited ministers in each other's Churches, to exchange in other ministerial services, and to the right of members of each Church to participate in the other's celebration of the Holy Communion and in ordinary worship.

We are fully sensible as to the desirability of also extending the scope of our intercommunion to other channels of church life, and of making it the means of mutual helpfulness in any way which may be possible and advisable; indeed we gladly hope and look for such a result.

But bearing in mind our antecedents, and especially our independence, we feel this desirable end must be attained by other means than what would amount to incorporation into the Anglican system. Our opinion is that by consultation and good feeling between the respective Authorities, possibilities and means of co-operation will be evolved, not on previously fixed lines, but in a natural way, in conformity with the requirements of our mutual interests, and as circumstances permit, and we believe that hindrances to

such co-operation having been removed, the inherent advantages of it will become more and more valued as such development, furthering the interests of both Churches, proceeds.

HERBERT R. MUMFORD,
Chairman.

133. *Reply of the Committee appointed by the
Archbishop of Canterbury to the Moravian
Committee on certain points raised by the
Lambeth Resolutions 1920*

MAY 1921

Resolution 70 (ii) of the Lambeth Conference of 1908 offered a description of the position which in the opinion of the Conference the *Unitas Fratrum* might be held to occupy when reunited with the Church of England. We are not altogether surprised that the Moravian Church is unprepared to adopt that description as its own. But we think that the language of the Resolution may be interpreted in a way that will not hurt the just and proper self-respect of the venerable *Unitas*.

English theologians have not been accustomed to speak of a plurality of Churches except in the only sense which has the sanction of the New Testament, viz. of the local branches of a single and undivided society. It is only in this sense that the Church of England itself claims to be a Church. It was presumably unwillingness to recognize two or more Churches in any other than the local sense that led the Conference of 1908 to use a form of words which might seem to do less than justice to the history and significance of the Moravian Church. In the light of what was done by the Conference of 1920 we venture to say that the ideal 'alliance' which

we contemplate is not an alliance between two separate Churches, but such an union as would make the Moravian Church of the British Provinces, after those alterations which its authorities are now ready to recommend, an integral part of a single reunited Church. The relation which we set before ourselves is not that of absorption, by which those now separated from us would become exactly such as we are, nor yet that of federation between bodies independent and exclusive of each other. It is of visible union and full brotherly communion between ourselves and associations of Christians who may differ from us in their practical system, and even to some extent in their theoretical outlook, but who are willing to be embraced with us in one comprehensive Church. The Church of England has no desire to lower the status of the Moravian Church, or to take away its autonomy. We believe that it would be a loss to Christendom if union were to be effected on terms which would hinder the free development of the *Unitas* on its own God-given lines. But we think that this development could go forward even more favourably within the larger unity, consisting (it must be remembered) not of the existing Church of England alone, but of the existing Church of England with the addition of the Moravian Church itself, to be joined eventually, as we hope, by others now in separation, as honoured and self-governing factors in the composition of the whole. Such is the meaning which we would attach to the phrase of 1908, 'a religious community' 'in close alliance with the Anglican Communion'.

With regard to point (c) within Resolution 70 (ii), we would recall to our Moravian brethren that our theory is that the Diocesan Bishops occupy a twofold position. On the one hand they are—as it is hoped that the Moravian Bishops will consider themselves to be—joint leaders of the Christian community at large, and on the other hand they are held responsible in some sense for all the souls within a

given area. Even now the spiritual welfare of many who do not acknowledge their authority is a matter of concern to them. It is hoped that after reunion the interest which they take in the Moravian Churches within their Dioceses may be welcomed and encouraged. But the desire for 'due recognition' does not mean that the Diocesan Bishops would seek to interfere in the internal affairs of the Moravian communities. Those communities would remain responsible to the Moravian Bishops alone. Their manner of Divine Service, their discipline, their finance, their missionary activities, would be independent of the Diocesan. The kind of 'recognition' intended is, for example, that the Diocesan should be consulted if the Brethren think of opening a church in a new place, and that Moravian presbyters should be assured of the consent of the Diocesan before they officiate in Anglican churches. It may be well to add, though assurances on this point have been repeatedly given, that after reunion the Moravian portion of the Church in this country would not enter into new relations with any other Christian bodies without conferring with their Anglican brethren. Their Anglican brethren on the other hand would not wish to weaken the connexion of the British Moravians with Herrnhut and the foreign Provinces of the Unitas.

The Moravian authorities have shown a most gratifying readiness to meet our wishes with regard to Confirmation. We are not sure, however, whether the proposal that 'authority to confirm be given to presbyters at their ordination' altogether satisfies the recommendation of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference that 'authority for such action on the part of presbyters was directly delegated to them by the Bishop' (*Report*, p. 158). It would rather seem to make Confirmation a normal part of the functions of the presbyter; whereas the Church of England, following the only examples known to Holy Scripture, regards it as proper to the highest order of the ministry. We think that 'direct

delegation' would rather imply a special commission on each occasion, or at least one renewable from time to time, and conferred only on particular presbyters.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

EDGAR C. S. GLOUCESTER,

May 2, 1921.

Chairman.

*134. A Memorandum from the Moravian
Committee on Anglican Relations to the
Archbishop's Committee*

JUNE, 1922

1. We thank the Anglican Committee for its reply to our last communication. In it we find an interpretation of the phrase 'religious community . . . in close alliance with the Anglican Communion' (see Lambeth Conference Resolution, 1908, 70. ii *b*). This interpretation, and indeed the whole tone of the communication, further illustrates the admirable spirit in which the Anglican Committee has approached the subject, and has considered our criticisms and suggestions from time to time. We thank you for this consideration, and for the more detailed description of what you conceive would be the relations between them in case of 'alliance' between the British Province of the Moravian Church and the Anglican Church being realized. A film of indefiniteness, however, seems to be thrown over your interpretation by the words by which it is introduced: 'we think that the language of the Resolution may be interpreted in a way', &c. It seems to us a necessity that some more exact description or statement should be given than one which may bear interpretations of widely differing import.

2. We thank you, also, for the repeated assurance that 'The Church of England has no desire to lower the status of the Moravian Church, or to take away its autonomy', and

for making it clear that the Moravian Church would have preserved and secured to it complete control in matters of its 'Divine service, discipline' (which we understand to cover all Church regulations), 'finance and missionary activities'.

3. (Resolution 70, ii c). It is quite clear to us that two Church Communions in close 'alliance' would naturally consult each other before taking steps leading to alliance with other Religious Bodies. What we desire from you, is a more emphatic assurance that any existing relations which we possess and enjoy with Christian Communities, with which we are already in inter-communion, would not be disturbed, and that the expression of that inter-communion should continue on our part to be quite free. In connexion with this may we draw your attention to Resolution 3 of our General Synod 1909: 'That we hold that Inter-communion with the Anglican Church must rest on the same mutual recognition and freedom to co-operate, as now exists between us and several Churches, Episcopal and other.' Also to Resolution 5, which speaks of 'recognizing the position of communicant members who have not been confirmed by a Bishop, or of communicant members of other Churches which do not observe this rite' (viz. Confirmation). These Resolutions, of course, do not cover all the ground of the relations referred to.

In reading the third paragraph of your last communication we find the difficult word to be 'authority', as attached to the diocesan Bishop. We assume the main feature of this authority to consist in our obligation to consult the Diocesan when we wish to open new work. We think it quite reasonable to ascertain his opinion and should not lightly set aside any objections on his part. But we could not readily submit to the view that his consent is an indispensable condition. The assured consent of the Diocesan before a Moravian Presbyterian officiates in an Anglican Church is quite in accord-

ance with what we stated in our last Memorandum in paragraph 2 under 'Resolution 70. ii c'.

Confirmation by Presbyters.

We regret that your reply does not meet us in the matter of presbyters administering the rite of Confirmation. The practice of our Church is admittedly not an innovation, for the practice was followed to some extent in the West, and has been and is still followed in the East. With Resolution 5 of our General Synod 1909 before us, also the Resolution of our Provincial Synod 1921, it would be difficult for us to go further in concession than what is contained in our last Memorandum. We have to bear in mind not only these Synodal Resolutions, but also the fact that in none of the Provinces of the Moravian Church is the practice followed of confirming only by Bishops, and that our common practice, as in the Eastern Church, of the ordained Minister of a Congregation confirming his own candidates, is highly valued by both ministers and people. We think you will appreciate the difficulty of establishing a practice in one Province of the Church, which is contrary to the practice for the same purpose throughout the rest of the Church. From our side we have to consider whether 'alliance' with the Anglican Communion would tend to alienate us from other parts of our Church, and to aim to avoid such an issue.

It would be of assistance to us if you could tell us whether there are any other points which it seems to you would have to be discussed and settled before an 'alliance' can be effected. We feel that this question of 'alliance' with the Anglican Church is of such vital importance to the whole membership of our Church in this Province that all the bearings of the matter must be laid before our congregations, so that the voice of the congregations may be expressed in Synod when the time comes for the question to

be decided. We think you will agree with us that 'alliance' would be worse than of no value unless we could carry the rank and file of our Church membership with us.

HERBERT R. MUMFORD,
Chairman.

*135. Letter from the Archbishop's Committee
to the Moravian Committee*

DECEMBER 1922

DEAR BISHOP MUMFORD,

We thought it best, by way of answer to your Memorandum of last June, to ask you to meet us and talk face to face over the questions raised. Your Committee was kind enough to do what we asked, on October 11, and we had a helpful discussion. You thought, however, at the end of our meeting that it would be more satisfactory to the brethren to have a written reply from us. We therefore endeavour to give such a reply.

1. We are grateful to you for the kind way in which you speak of the spirit in which our last written communication was drawn up. We are indeed convinced that perfect frankness, together with sympathy for the views of others, is the only way in which the unity of the Church can be restored. We confess that we were surprised at your feeling that 'a film of indefiniteness' was thrown over the interpretation which we gave of a certain phrase, by our saying that we thought that the language of the Resolution might be 'interpreted' in the way we suggested. We are not plenipotentiaries; therefore we did not presume to offer a dogmatic definition of words which were not our own. But we cannot think for a moment that the Bishops of the Church of England will repudiate us. We have been appointed authoritatively to conduct these negotiations with the

Unitas Fratrum, and it is unlikely to the last degree that our actions and interpretations will be thrown over by those who entrusted us with the duty.

2. We need make no further observations upon this point.

3. Upon your third point it may be necessary to enlarge somewhat. Although the expression 'alliance' occurs in the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference of 1908, we have in our negotiations with you made it clear that the conception of a mere 'alliance' does not satisfy us. We contemplate something more. We believe that what our Lord desires is union. We have explained sufficiently that union is not inconsistent with that autonomy of which the last paragraph spoke. But that union must make us not two Churches but one Church. If you will accept the phrase already famous in your history, *ecclesiola in ecclesia*, it would express our view of the relationship—except perhaps the diminutive: let us rather say *ecclesia*, but *in ecclesia*. Such a relationship cannot but affect to some extent the freedom of the two bodies united. The Bishops of the Unitas, if the union takes place, would have the right to expound their views in the gatherings of the Bishops of England, and would doubtless be heard with the deference which is their due—particularly in all matters which concern what may be called the foreign politics of the Church. In like manner the Bishops of the Unitas would, we are sure, be careful to take no action likely to embarrass their brother Bishops in the whole body to which they belong.

The answer to the question whether any existing relations would be disturbed by such an union depends upon the previous question, what the existing relations are. We have already said that we do not seek to weaken at all the connexion between the Moravians of the British Provinces and Herrnhut. Though the connexion may cause some anomalies in theory, we believe that in practice these would be got over without difficulty, and that the connexion would be fruitful

for good. The Church of Sweden, for example, reckons the Augustana Synod of America to be her daughter Church in full communion with herself, although the American daughter has no Bishops. This did not hinder the Bishops at Lambeth in 1920 from recommending that English Bishops should take part in consecrating Swedish Bishops, which was regarded as a most solemn and official act of communion. It was felt that this did not commit the Church of England constructively to communion with the Augustana Synod. On the same principle we shall not feel committed to anything which we have not approved by your remaining in the connexion which you now have with Herrnhut; and we hope that when your union with us is completed, your influence upon Herrnhut may succeed in making Herrnhut still more a centre of reunion on the Continent than it is at present.

It may be otherwise with regard to some other bodies, particularly in this country. We speak in the freedom of brotherly intercourse, without censuring others. A recent action on the part of a prominent member of the Unitas gives a pointed example of what we mean. The 'Reformed Church of England' is a body which has detached itself quite recently from the English Church with no other *raison d'être*, as far as we know, than the conviction that the English Church is at present disloyal to the principles for which it nominally stands. Now to do anything which helps to establish and perpetuate such a body is, manifestly, to encourage, or at least to condone, the spirit of division or schism. It is to approve of the tendency to disintegration. Obviously no one could at the same time desire union with the Church of England and promote the separate interests of groups who leave it, unless under a misapprehension. The same observation applies in some degree to other groups of earlier separation. We thankfully note that there is less of sectarian feeling among these than there

formerly was, and the Church of England will look to the *Unitas Fratrum* for aid in promoting reunion with them—not on the principle of acquiescing in divisions, but in healing them.

You quote from the Resolutions of 1909 a reference to the mutual recognition which already exists between yourselves 'and several Churches, Episcopal and other'. It will perhaps conduce to clearness if you will be so kind as to furnish us with a list of the Churches referred to. It was something of a surprise to us to learn that the 'Reformed Church of England', for instance, was in full inter-communion with you. In our conference with Bishop Hassé in November 1909 we were assured that no corporate relations with any Church but the Anglican had ever been considered by the *Unitas*.

We quite understand that large individual liberty in these matters has been permitted. We do not complain of it. No very strict discipline over private individuals is enforced among ourselves. Nonconformist ministers occasionally present themselves as communicants at our altars, and are not repelled. Many members of our communion, on passing into Scotland, attend the Presbyterian services without incurring reproof. But these are not official actions. They are not publicly encouraged. While we should be unwilling to lay down a stricter rule for the *Unitas Fratrum* than exists for Anglicans, we cannot advise our Moravian brethren on being united with us to exercise Sacramental Communion with communities (other than the Foreign Provinces of the *Unitas*) which are not in recognized communion with the Church of England. The Holy Communion, to our mind, is not the symbol of private goodwill, but of public and corporate unity. More particularly we regard the Bishop as always and necessarily representing his Church, and bound always to be mindful of the tie which binds him to his brother Bishops.

And here we beg leave to remind you of an assurance already given to us both in private conference and by public authority. Bishop Hassé in 1909 told us that the Unitas in England had 'never accepted a minister of other communities, as such, as a Moravian minister'. He said that in the U.S.A. ministers of other communities had been accepted as Deacons, but then had been ordained Presbyters. In 1911, in reply to a question from the Anglican Committee, the Moravian Bishops and Elders officially stated: 'The Ordinances are ministered among us solely by our own ministers, all of them Episcopally ordained. Ministers of other, non-Episcopal, Churches who enter our Service receive in every case Ordination as Presbyters from our Bishops'. If we understood your Committee rightly in October, this assurance is no longer correct, and ministers of other denominations have been permitted to celebrate the Eucharist in your churches. We must point out the gravity of the change.

It is not that we deny or doubt the blessing bestowed upon ministers ecclesiastically imperfect. But we have been led to believe that in the Church of the Brethren we have to do with a people who value history, and who stand, as we do, for continuity and order. This was markedly shown in the first inception of your separate Ministry, when the action of the Brethren was based upon the determination to 'take thought for the things that are good not only before God, but also before all men'. Our desire is that other bodies of Christians besides yourselves may be brought to share in all that we believe we have inherited from the ancient Church. It is for this reason that we cannot enter into communion with them at present, leading them to believe that their present condition is all that it ought to be. For the security of our common Sacraments we shall be compelled to ask that, in the event of our union, the assurances given us in 1909 and 1911 may be adhered to.

MEMORANDUM WITH REGARD TO CONFIRMATION

We have no commission to go beyond or to recede from the terms laid down by the Lambeth Conference in this matter, but we feel bound to demur to some assertions contained in your paper of June 1922. The Church of England desires above all things to be loyal to Holy Scripture; and in Scripture there is no recorded instance of any but an Apostle laying on hands after Baptism. You justly observe that it is the common practice of the Eastern Church for presbyters to administer the equivalent unction; but 'from the beginning it was not so', and even now the fact that the chrism must be consecrated by the Bishop testifies that the practice is an 'innovation', though of long standing. That presbyteral Confirmation was an 'innovation' in the West, and very exceptionally allowed, is shown by the language of a Roman writer (John the Deacon) about the beginning of the sixth century, who says that there are cases where 'force of necessity' compels presbyters to 'make the holy chrism', as in Africa, where all the Catholic Bishops had been driven into exile, but adds that the Bishops had given permission to do it, so that it might be considered their own act. These were the kind of facts which led the Bishops at Lambeth in 1920 to desire that, in the event of presbyteral Confirmation being continued among you, it should be 'distinctly laid down that authority for such action on the part of presbyters was directly delegated to them by the Bishop', in which case 'it might be possible' for such Confirmation 'to be regarded as no bar to the measure of intercommunion proposed'.

We cannot think of any particular points which have not been sufficiently discussed between us. But while we are willing to exercise all reasonable forethought in order to meet questions that may arise between the uniting Churches, we venture to say that many details must remain to be settled

by the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the practical experience of the reunited community. The Brethren will not be slow to recognize that the Church of England is exercising a considerable measure of faith in seeking union with a Church which has no documentary creed, a liturgy very unlike her own, and traditions which are largely unknown to her members. She is seeking that union on the most honorific terms that can be devised. She does so because she believes that it is the will of Christ. Not forgetting that there are others to be drawn into a like unity, she begins with the Brethren, partly because the providence of God, without choice of hers, has pointed in that direction—partly because she discerns among you special signs of the grace of God and of the love which overcomes all difficulties. We recognize that for you too it is a great adventure. We only ask you to trust us, as we trust you. We believe that where there is that mutual trust and goodwill, problems will find their solution as we go forward.

I am, Yours faithfully,

EDGAR C. S. GLOUCESTER

Signed on behalf of the Committee.

December 12, 1922.

136. Reply of Moravian Committee on Anglican Relations to the Archbishop's Committee's Letter dated December 12, 1922

We thank you for your letter, and quite agree with you that perfect candour is the safest and most satisfactory road by which a right conclusion of our negotiations may be reached.

(1) We regard the central part of your letter as the most important. The expression 'the Moravians of the British Province and Herrnhut' (3, par. 2) is probably not intended

by you to be understood in the sense that other provinces of the Moravian Church (American and Foreign Mission Fields) are excluded, though it might be so interpreted.

(2) The paragraphs which follow refer to our relations with other branches of the Christian Church. Much of what they contain seems to gather round 'the expression 'corporate unity'. It may be that our view of what 'corporate unity' means is not identical with yours, and from this arises some misunderstanding between us when the term is used. A definition of the term as understood by us therefore appears to be necessary.

By 'corporate union' we understand a unity of constitution organized throughout under one general authority—a unity closer than that of a Federation in which the component parts are not so linked together.

By 'Inter-communion' we understand a Church relationship in which exists an implicitly or explicitly conceded liberty to avail oneself of the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments in other Communion. This implies a recognition of the validity of other Ministries on the same foundation of Doctrine, but not an amalgamation or fusion of such Ministries and the Ministry of our own Church.

We regard this as the natural relation between the several households of the faith arising from their common relation to our one Lord, without any express sanction by the constitutional authorities of the churches concerned; but in cases where such express sanction is felt to be desirable we would do everything possible to secure it.

Corporate Union in the above sense we have never had with any Church. Federal Union we have in England and Wales with the other religious bodies of the Free Church Federation, and on the Continent of Europe with other Reformation Churches.

Inter-communion we have had in the past in varying degrees with the Anglican and other State Churches, and

with free religious bodies in many lands, sometimes with, and sometimes without, expressed sanction of the constitutional authorities of our own or of the other Churches.

It is such 'inter-communion' with the Anglican Church that we have desired to quicken and extend, with formal sanction of the Anglican authorities so far as that is felt from their side to be needful.

(3) At the joint meeting of the two Committees last October the question was raised whether an ordained minister of one of the Free Churches could administer the rite of Holy Communion in one of our Congregations. Our reply was that there is nothing in the principles or regulations of our Church to forbid this. The matter is again raised in your last letter (3, par. 6), and was discussed by us at our last meeting. We find no express rule forbidding a non-episcopally ordained minister to 'celebrate' the Communion in our Church, no necessity for such a rule having apparently ever made itself felt, owing to the fact that the practice of our Church in England, from which no exception is known to us, is that only our own ministers act as 'celebrants'. Therefore the assurance of 1911 is in accordance with our present use, and we are sorry if your Committee gathered a contrary impression on October 11, 1922.

(4) There must be some misunderstanding in regard to Bishop Hassé's statement made in 1909, which you quote as follows: 'that the Unitas in England had never accepted a minister of other communities, as such, as a Moravian minister'. Our rule since 1909 is as follows: 'Ministers who have received consecration for Church service in Protestant Churches, which do not recognize the three grades of ordination, and have already served a congregation with the Word and Sacrament, and in the cure of souls, when they become members of the Moravian Church, and are called to a spiritual office, pass as Deacons. But this regulation shall not hinder

the Provincial Boards, in extraordinary cases, from acting as seems best to them'.

In conclusion we repeat what has been stated in our previous communications, that we are most desirous to see the Church of Christ bearing its united witness before the world as one body of believers in Christ and in the truth as revealed in and through Him. But it may be, and indeed is, in many minds a matter of doubt whether the best method for attaining union of the many branches of the Church is by laying down and insisting on principles such as those underlying 3, par. 5 of your letter. In reference to this paragraph a few remarks on our part seem necessary.

To us, too, sacramental communion within one's own spiritual household is the most significant and effective symbol of the close union of its members, and on that account it is uniquely precious and possesses a special import, such as sacramental communion outside one's own borders is not likely to possess or convey.

But when you say that in the event of our union with the Anglican Church the exercise of sacramental communion with communions not recognized by the Church of England cannot be advised, we feel constrained to make our position quite clear, lest there be more expected of us than we can concede.

We have already indicated in par. 2 of this letter that with us inter-communion with other Churches in as far as it exists, is by tacit permission on both sides and not by treaty or official agreement, and by that we wish to abide. It is therefore incumbent upon us to state quite frankly that we in no way can encourage any change in this respect, either in the spirit or in the letter; no restraint can be urged upon our members in this matter, nor can any adverse reflection be cast upon the exercise of such liberty. On the contrary, we wish it to be understood that this liberty may be used with the full cognizance of our church and that there

is no taint of irregularity or undesirability attaching to it. For to us the special value of sacramental communion within our own spiritual household is not incompatible with availing oneself of the privileges of a guest or sharing as far as that is possible the joys and blessings of others not in immediate church connexion with us; and we feel that any disapproval or discouragement in this respect, whether implicit or explicit, public or private, implies an adverse judgement on the value of the ordinances of other communions and conduces to a spirit of aloofness and separation alien to the character of our church and little calculated to further the cause of Christian Union.

Signed by all the members of the Moravian Committee,

P. ASMUSSEN.	H. J. WILSON.
J. E. ZIPPEL.	ARTHUR WARD.
J. N. LIBBEY.	H. R. MUMFORD.

*137. Letter from the Archbishop's Committee to
the Moravian Committee on Anglican Relations*

ST. GILES' HOUSE, FAREHAM, HANTS.

NOVEMBER 26, 1923.

MY DEAR BISHOP MUMFORD,

Your last letter in reply to ours of December 12, 1922, has brought us not a little sorrow and disappointment, though we thank you for its clear and candid statement of the Moravian position; about which perhaps we had been too sanguine.

You will remember that what was originally in contemplation was an 'alliance' of the Moravians with the Church of England. This 'alliance' was understood to be a thing quite unique, such as had never been formed between the *Unitas Fratrum* and any other corporate body, and was never likely to be thought of in any other connexion.

Now, if we understand aright, the only thing which the Unitas in England desires, or is prepared for, is to be on the same terms with the Church of England as it already is with many others. If we are mistaken, you will tell us, but such is our impression.

If this be the case, perhaps it will be better that our direct negotiations with you should pause, and that we should await the result of those discussions which happily are going on between representatives of the English Church and various Evangelical Free Churches in the spirit which animated the last Lambeth Conference.

This does not imply any lessening of our affection for the Unitas Fratrum, or of our earnest desire for the 'alliance' of which we have spoken. We acknowledge gratefully the patience, the friendliness, the readiness to remove hindrances, with which we have been met. We trust that these qualities will have their effect on the more general discussions that are now taking place.

Yours very sincerely,

EDGAR C. S. GIBSON, Bishop

Signed on behalf of the Anglican Committee.

*138. Final Letter from the Moravian Committee
to the Archbishop's Committee on Anglican
Relations with the Moravian Church*

MORAVIAN CHURCH HOUSE,
32 FETTER LANE, LONDON, E.C. 4.

MARCH 31, 1924.

MY DEAR CANON MASON,

In reply to your letter dated November 26, 1923, we wish in the first place to convey to you our appreciation of the cordial expression of regard in which our Church is held by

our Anglican brethren. We trust you will believe that we cherish similar feelings towards you and the Church you represent. We value your acknowledgement of our endeavours to meet you on various points. If our last communication brought you 'sorrow and disappointment' we can but express our regret.

1. In that communication we endeavoured to state clearly and candidly our position, having in view the Resolutions of the Moravian General Synod of 1909. We regard these as the foundation of the negotiations as carried on from our side. In them it is clearly laid down that, whatever may be the terms agreed upon between us, our existing relations with other Christian Communion must not be sacrificed.

2. The second paragraph of your letter states that 'what was originally in contemplation was an "alliance" of the Moravians with the Church of England'. We believe that the subject of our mutual relations was first introduced with a view to ascertain whether Anglican and Moravian Bishops might assist each other by taking ordinations and confirmations in the West Indies in cases where distance created great inconvenience. But so far as we can ascertain, the actual use of the term 'alliance' only found its way into the negotiations considerably later: viz. after the Lambeth Conference of 1908; and we may point out that the Resolutions of our General Synod passed after the Lambeth Conference just referred to still use the term 'inter-communion'. The implications of an 'Alliance' vary according to the interpretation of its meaning, or, again, as circumstances may point. We hold that Christians of various organizations should always be allies in the truest sense of the term, and that the important thing is that they should find a right expression of this relationship. We are sure that has not been lost sight of by either party in these negotiations. We still prefer the term 'inter-communion'

as pointing to a definite mutual recognition, and expressing that recognition in a practical way. Though we have inter-communion with other Churches, such a relationship with you was intended to be fuller ecclesiastically than we have with other Churches, inasmuch as we do not delegate their ministers to ordain to the ministry of our Church, nor to confirm our candidates for Church membership.

3. We think therefore that you have in some measure mistaken our position when you say 'if we understand aright, the only thing which the Unitas in England desires, or is prepared for, is to be on the same terms with the Church of England as it already is with many others'. We are different from them in administration, in 'orders', and in observing confirmation as the rite through which full church membership is given; and in all these we conform far more closely to the usages of the Church of England. These facts are not regarded lightly by us. Nor do we forget the close fellowship of leaders of the two Churches in the long past.

4. Negotiations for closer fellowship in work between the two bodies having so much in common might well be regarded as full of promise. Indeed the hope has been cherished amongst us, as also among you, that they might produce the first-fruits of that union of the Church of Christ for which so many are praying and working. If a necessary measure of agreement cannot be found between us, it might well be asked how agreement can be reached between the Church of England and other Churches. To us it would seem very regrettable if our attempts to arrive at a mutual understanding and agreement were to cease.

5. Looking back over the whole course of the negotiations, and the communications which have passed between us, we believe they have led to a fuller understanding of those principles we each hold. We had hopes that a measure of

inter-communion might be adopted leading, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, to growth of fuller mutual understanding and sympathy, and to the development of united work. We trust this may yet come to pass.

Signed by the Members of the Moravian Committee,

P. ASMUSSEN.

J. N. LIBBEY.

A. WARD.

H. J. WILSON.

J. E. ZIPPEL.

H. R. MUMFORD.

VII. THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK

144. The Message of the Conference

STOCKHOLM, AUGUST 29, 1925

I

1. The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, assembled at Stockholm from August 19 to 30, 1925, and composed of representatives of the greater number of Christian communions coming from thirty-seven nations of the Old and New Worlds, and of the Near and Far East, sends this brotherly message to all followers of Christ, beseeching them to join with them in prayer, confession, thanksgiving, study, and service. We regret that not all Christian communions have found it possible to accept our invitation, for in view of the vital and far-reaching issues with which we have been concerned, we cannot but hope for that co-operation of all parts of the Church of Christ without which its testimony and influence in the world must be incomplete.

2. For five years men and women have planned and prayed that this Conference might be held. Other efforts for closer relations between the Churches have prepared the way. But this has proved the most signal instance of fellowship and co-operation, across the boundaries of nations and confessions, which the world has yet seen. The sins and sorrows, the struggles and losses of the Great War and since, have compelled the Christian Churches to recognize, humbly and with shame, that 'the world is too strong for a divided Church'. Leaving for the time our differences in Faith and Order, our aim has been to secure united practical action in Christian Life and Work. The Conference itself is a conspicuous fact. But it is only a beginning.

3. We confess before God and the world the sins and

failures of which the Churches have been guilty, through lack of love and sympathetic understanding. Loyal seekers after truth and righteousness have been kept away from Christ, because His followers have so imperfectly represented Him to mankind. The call of the present hour to the Church should be repentance, and with repentance a new courage springing from the inexhaustible resources which are in Christ.

4. It is a matter for deep thankfulness that in the plan of God and through the guidance of His Spirit the representatives of so many Christian communions have been led to assemble and have renewed in common fellowship their faith, hope, and love in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. It is a matter for deep thankfulness that in spite of differences, sincere and profound, they have been enabled to discuss so many difficult problems with a candour, a charity, and a self-restraint, which the Spirit of God alone could inspire. As we repeated the Lord's Prayer together, each in the speech his mother taught him, we realized afresh our common faith, and experienced as never before the unity of the Church of Christ.

II

5. The Conference has deepened and purified our devotion to the Captain of our Salvation. Responding to His call, 'Follow Me', we have in the presence of the Cross accepted the urgent duty of applying His Gospel in all realms of human life—industrial, social, political, and international.

6. Thus in the sphere of economics we have declared that the soul is the supreme value, that it must not be subordinated to the rights of property or to the mechanism of industry, and that it may claim as its first right the right of salvation. Therefore we contend for the free and full development of the human personality. In the name of the Gospel we have affirmed that industry should not be based

solely on the desire for individual profit, but that it should be conducted for the service of the community. Property should be regarded as a stewardship for which an account must be given to God. Co-operation between capital and labour should take the place of conflict, so that employers and employed alike may be enabled to regard their part in industry as the fulfilment of a vocation. Thus alone can we obey our Lord's command, to do unto others even as we would they should do unto us.

7. In the realm of social morality we considered the problems presented by overcrowding, unemployment, laxity of morals, drink and its evils, crime and the criminal. Here we were led to recognize that these problems are so grave that they cannot be solved by individual effort alone, but that the community must accept responsibility for them, and must exercise such social control over individual action as in each instance may be necessary for the common good. We have not neglected the more intimate questions which a higher appreciation of personality raises in the domain of education, the family and the vocation, questions which affect woman, the child, and the worker. The Church must contend not for the rights of the individual as such, but for the rights of the moral personality, since all mankind is enriched by the full unfolding of even a single soul.

8. We have also set forth the guiding principles of a Christian internationalism, equally opposed to a national bigotry and a weak cosmopolitanism. We have affirmed the universal character of the Church, and its duty to preach and practise the love of the brethren. We have considered the relation of the individual conscience to the state. We have examined the race problem, the subject of law and arbitration, and the constitution of an international order which would provide peaceable methods for removing the causes of war—questions which in the tragic conditions of

to-day make so deep an appeal to our hearts. We summon the Churches to share with us our sense of the horror of war, and of its futility as a means of settling international disputes, and to pray and work for the fulfilment of the promise that under the sceptre of the Prince of Peace, 'mercy and truth shall meet together, righteousness and peace shall kiss each other'.

9. We have not attempted to offer precise solutions, nor have we confirmed by a vote the results of our friendly discussions. This was due not only to our respect for the convictions of individuals or groups, but still more to the feeling that the mission of the Church is above all to state principles, and to assert the ideal, while leaving to individual consciences and to communities the duty of applying them with charity, wisdom, and courage.

III

10. If this goal is to be attained we recognize the pressing need of education. The individual must be educated by the Church, so that he may be enabled to exercise a Christian discernment in all things. The Churches must educate themselves by study, conference, and prayer, so that being led by the Spirit of Truth into all truth, they may be enabled in increasing measure to apprehend the mind of Christ. We recognize that the root of evil is to be found in the human will, and we therefore desire to re-emphasize our conviction that this will must be surrendered to the high and holy will of God, whose service is perfect freedom. Even Christian ideas and ideals cannot save the world if separated from their personal source in the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and unless themselves taken up into the personal life of the believer.

11. To this end we address our appeal first to all Christians. Let each man, following his own conscience, and putting his convictions to the test of practical life, accept his full

personal responsibility for the doing of God's Will on earth as it is in heaven, and in working for God's Kingdom. Let him in entire loyalty to his own Church seek to have a share in that wider fellowship and co-operation of the Christian Churches of which this Conference is a promise and pledge. In the name of this wider fellowship we would send a special message of sympathy to all those who amid circumstances of persecution and trial are fulfilling their Christian calling, and we would comfort them with the thought that they are thus brought into fellowship with the sufferings of Christ.

12. But we cannot confine this appeal to the Churches, for we gratefully recognize that now we have many allies in this holy cause.

We turn to the young of all countries. With keen appreciation we have heard of their aspirations and efforts for a better social order as expressed in the youth movements of many lands. We desire to enlist the ardour and energy of youth, the freshness and the fullness of their life, in the service of the Kingdom of God and of humanity.

We think also of those who are seeking after truth, by whatever way, and ask their help. As Christ is the Truth, so Christ's Church heartily welcomes every advance of reason and conscience among men. Particularly we would invite the co-operation of those teachers and scholars who in many realms possess the influence and command the knowledge without which the solution of our pressing practical problems is impossible.

In the name of the Son of Man, the Carpenter of Nazareth, we send this message to the workers of the world. We thankfully record the fact that at present even under difficult conditions a multitude of workers in the different countries are acting in accordance with these principles. We deplore the causes of misunderstanding and estrangement which still exist and are determined to do our part to remove them. We share their aspirations after a just and fraternal social

order, through which the opportunity shall be assured for the development, according to God's design, of the full manhood of every man.

13. We have said that this Conference is only a beginning. We cannot part without making some provision for the carrying on of our work. We have therefore decided to form a Continuation Committee to follow up what has been begun, to consider how effect can be given to the suggestions which have been made, to examine the practicability of calling another such Conference at a future date, and in particular to take steps for that further study of difficult problems and that further education of ourselves and of our churches, on which all wise judgement and action must be based. May we not hope that through the work of this body, and through the increasing fellowship and co-operation of the Christians of all nations in the one Spirit, our oneness in Christ may be more and more revealed to the world in Life and Work?

14. Only as we become inwardly one shall we attain real unity of mind and spirit. The nearer we draw to the Crucified, the nearer we come to one another, in however varied colours the Light of the World may be reflected in our faith. Under the Cross of Jesus Christ we reach out hands to one another. The Good Shepherd had to die in order that he might gather together the scattered children of God. In the Crucified and Risen Lord alone lies the world's hope.

Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen.

PRINTED LITHOGRAPHICALLY IN
GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE
UNIVERSITY PRESS
OXFORD
BY
CHARLES BATEY
PRINTER
TO THE
UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



134 693

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY