

RELATIONS BETWEEN ANGLICANS AND ORTHODOX: THEIR THEOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

JAMES L. MONKS, S.J.

Weston College

THE existence of cordial relations of friendship between representatives of the Anglican Churches and those of the Eastern Orthodox Churches is well known even to the casual reader of ecclesiastical news bulletins. More informed readers know that these relationships are the result of long years of mutual endeavor to reach an understanding in matters of doctrine, that would permit intercommunion, at first partial, later complete, when full agreement on dogmatic points of belief had been reached. The fact that five autocephalous Eastern Churches—Constantinople, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Cyprus, and Rumania—have recognized the validity of Anglican orders would seem to indicate that intercommunion must be well on the way. The Catholic reader is apt to be a bit puzzled, however, because he thinks of the Anglican communion as a Protestant product and of the Orthodox as a group which retained many of the Catholic doctrines rejected by Protestantism; he is at a loss, then, to understand how the present apparent proximity could have evolved.

The exposition here offered attempts to clarify the doctrinal position of the two communions by tracing its development in the mutual efforts made during a period of over two hundred years to arrive at dogmatic agreement. Not every effort nor every point of doctrine that has been discussed is treated here, but a summary is offered of notable instances and principal points that have been continually under discussion. Only a thorough reading of all the documents could give a precise knowledge of the situation, but a sufficient estimate of the extent of mutual agreement can be formed from the following material.

THE NONJURORS AND THE PATRIARCHS

Members of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches have carried on communications concerning theological problems since the seventeenth century. One of the more interesting early documents of these relations is a "Synodical answer to the question, what are the senti-

ments of the Oriental Church of the Greek Orthodox? Sent to the lovers of the Greek Church in Britain in the year of our Lord, 1672." It was issued probably at the instigation of John Covel, the Anglican chaplain to the English ambassador at Constantinople, 1670-77, who had been urged by two professors at Cambridge University to inquire into the doctrine of the Real Presence as held by the Greeks.¹ Far more interesting and extensive is the correspondence between the Orthodox—Greek and Russian—and the Nonjurors. The Nonjurors were a group of the beneficed clergy of the Church of England who were given this name when they refused, in 1689, to take the oaths of allegiance to William and Mary, the successors to the throne of the exiled James II.² Calling themselves the "catholick remnant of the British Churches," they decided in 1716 to send a series of theological propositions to the Greek Church in an endeavor to bring about a union. Arsenius, the Metropolitan of Thebais, who was in England at the time, carried the proposals to Russia, where he sought and gained the approval of the plan by Tsar Peter the Great. The latter then sent the proposals, in the care of James, the Protosyncellus, to the Patriarch of Alexandria, who was to communicate them to the four Eastern Patriarchs.³ Thus began a period of negotiations, carried on by correspondence, that lasted until 1725, when Archbishop Wake of Canterbury, hearing of what had happened, gave the plan its deathblow by writing to the Patriarch Chrysanthus of Jerusalem and informing him of the discredited status of the Nonjurors in relation to the Anglican Church.

The value of the documents which record this venture comes from the fact that in them we find under discussion the key points of doctrine which will constitute the substance of many a later conference. However partisan the Nonjurors may have been, they have given us a fairly accurate representation of current belief among Anglican divines of that period; for they did not separate themselves from their brethren on grounds of theological doctrine. The Orthodox for their part, represented by three widely separated patriarchates and their bishops,

¹ George Williams, *The Orthodox and the Nonjurors* (London, 1868), pp. viii-xxvi.

² A. W. Holland, "Nonjurors," *Encyclopedia Britannica* (13th ed.; New York, 1926), XIX, 736 f.

³ J. D. Mansi, *Sanctorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio* (Florentiae et alibi, 1759 sqq.), XXXVII, col. 373. The proposals are found in col. 383-94; 604-9.

insisted repeatedly on the continuity and traditionality of their statements, and assuredly portrayed the common Orthodox belief of their day. Hence, when the doctrine contained in modern documents is explicitly considered, it will be necessary to refer back to the record of this early effort for a thorough understanding of the progress—or the lack of it—towards theological agreement between Anglicans and Orthodox.

WILLIAM PALMER AND THE RUSSIANS

The episode of William Palmer is perhaps the best known, and certainly the most fascinating to study, of all the attempts to arrive at mutual agreement on matters of doctrine. William Palmer was a tutor and examiner at Oxford. Authors generally distinguish him from his contemporary, William Palmer of Worcester College, by referring to him as "Deacon Palmer"; he had been ordained a deacon in the Anglican Church in 1836.⁴ It was during his years of Oxford life that an effort to Catholicize the Anglican Church began, under the leadership of the Tractarians. This effort became known as the Oxford Movement. Palmer was vitally interested in it and took part in its development, but in his own particular way: instead of entering into the public activities of the Tractarians at home, he sought to establish the theories of the Catholicizing party by comparative study abroad, both of the Catholic Church and of the Orthodox Church. The story of his adventure has been told by himself; later authors have analyzed its significance or added to its details from supplementary documents.⁵ The following brief account is sufficient for our purpose.

On May 21, 1839, when Grand Duke Alexander of Russia was visiting Oxford, Palmer met him and arranged plans for a visit to Russia to study the theology and ritual of the Russian Church for the purpose of facilitating the reunion of the two communions. The

⁴ P. E. Shaw, *The Early Tractarians and the Eastern Church* (Milwaukee, 1930), p. 20; cf. p. 51.

⁵ Our narrative is drawn principally from the following: William Palmer, *Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church*, selected and arranged by Cardinal Newman (London, 1882); *An Appeal to the Scottish Bishops* (Edinburgh, 1849); *A Harmony of Anglican Doctrines with the Doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolic Churches of the East* (Aberdeen, 1846); Stanislas Tyszkiewicz, "Un épisode du mouvement d'Oxford: la mission de William Palmer," *Études*, CXXXVI (1913), 43-63; 190-210; C. A. Bolton, "William Palmer et les Orthodoxes," *Irénikon*, IX (1932), 321-44; P. E. Shaw, *op. cit.*, pp. 32 ff.

next year he received permission to make the voyage from Dr. Rough, the President of Magdalen, who gave him a letter of recommendation asking for protection and assistance from the Emperor and the Russian bishops and requesting that he be admitted to communion in the sacraments, provided his faith be found integral. Because of this last request, neither the College authorities nor Howley, the Archbishop of Canterbury, would approve the letter. Arriving in Russia on August 19, 1840, Palmer soon presented his recommendations to Count Pratasoff, the High Procurator of the Holy Synod, who requested him to write a letter to be presented to the Emperor explaining his purpose in coming to Russia as well as the assistance he hoped to receive. Many conversations and negotiations with Russian churchmen ensued, but after some nine months of dispute, study, and travel, he returned to Oxford without having fulfilled his desire.

Nothing daunted, he was back in Russia again by October, 1842, this time as the delegate of the Protestant Episcopal bishop for France, Mathew Luscombe,⁶ who had given him a certified declaration of faith, practically equivalent to the Orthodox doctrines, demanding on its strength communion in the Russian Church for him. The reply of the Holy Synod was a refusal to consider the appeal on the grounds that it represented merely the private views of Palmer and his bishop and hence was not a sufficient indication that the whole Anglican Church rejected the heresies contained in the Thirty-nine Articles. Palmer argued strenuously against this implication and even went to the extreme of anathematizing before the Synod a series of propositions which, it asserted, were either contained in, or could easily be deduced from, the Thirty-nine Articles.⁷ He then returned to England to obtain an official approval of his confession of faith and a confirmation of the anathemas; but he received only reproach for his conduct from the Archbishop of Canterbury, and a refusal of a decision from the Scottish bishops to whom he appealed. Convinced that his theory concerning the Catholicity of the Anglican communion had been proved false, he sought entrance into the Orthodox Church, but a discrepancy

⁶ Palmer had sought out Luscombe's assistance in connection with the case of Princess Galitzin, who considered herself a convert from Russian Orthodoxy to Anglicanism; Cf. W. Palmer, *An Appeal*, p. 15 ff.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 280.

between the Greeks and Russians regarding his rebaptism provided an obstacle he could not surmount. At long last, he turned his steps towards Rome, where he was received into the Church on February 28, 1855.

The extensive doctrinal expositions contained in the documents which concern this episode give us a sufficiently clear idea of the relative positions of the two Churches. The value of the statements made by Palmer may be questioned, as not giving a fair representation of the essential belief of Anglicanism, because of his peculiar Tractarian interpretations; but this fact only serves to bring into sharper contrast the unreconciled differences. As for the Russians, the assertions made by the higher authorities are a safe guide for understanding their general belief. We shall refer back to these sources when estimating the trend of the mutual relations.

EFFORTS OF BISHOPS AND CHURCH ASSOCIATIONS

After Palmer's time there followed a long period of ever increasing interest on the part of many Anglicans in the history and religion of the Eastern Orthodox Churches—an interest due in no small measure to the development of the Oxford Movement and the studies made by its adherents seeking Catholic principles and background in the Fathers, the early Church, and the primitive rites. Such men as John Neale of Cambridge University, George Williams, and, later on, W. J. Birkbeck were outstanding in their work.

In July, 1863, the Lower House of Canterbury appointed a committee to communicate with the American Protestant Episcopal Church, which had taken the initiative, "as to Intercommunion with the Russo-Greek Church."⁸ This resulted in correspondence and conferences which manifested differences of doctrine regarding infallibility, baptism, the procession of the Holy Spirit, and the invocation of the Blessed Virgin and the saints.⁹

There were representatives of both the Anglican and Orthodox Churches at the Bonn Conferences of 1874 and 1875, which were arranged by the Old Catholic, Dr. Döllinger, for the purpose of producing "a renewed common confession" leading to a "re-establishment

⁸ G. J. Slosser, *Christian Unity: Its History and Challenge* (London, 1929), p. 213.

⁹ *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, VII (1907), 380 f.; cited hereafter as *IKZ*.

of an intercommunion and churchly federation" within certain limits.¹⁰ At the first conference, some measure of agreement was reached regarding Holy Scripture and tradition, the practice of confession, prayers for the dead, and the Eucharistic celebration.¹¹ The principal result of the second conference was the agreement reached regarding the procession of the Holy Ghost; but the articles expressing the doctrine were subject to various interpretations.¹²

The first really definite statement of the general attitude of the Anglican bishops to reunion with the Orthodox was made at the Lambeth Conference of 1888. In their encyclical letter they expressed a desire to confirm and improve the friendly relations existing between the two Churches and presented the doctrinal position which they held to be a necessary standard for fuller communion.¹³ While the Conference was going on, a letter came from the British Embassy in Petrograd, telling of the approaching religious commemoration of Russian Christianity at Kieff. The information was communicated to Archbishop Benson, who resolved to take this opportunity to open communications with the Russian Church. Accordingly, a letter was drawn up and sent to Metropolitan Platon of Kieff, expressing sympathy and goodwill for the occasion, mentioning the necessity of standing against Rome, the common foe, and praying for the unity of all men in the Gospel. Platon's reply rather unexpectedly made a direct demand for the conditions under which the Anglicans would consider a union possible. In March of the following year, the bishops of England sent a despatch expressing their concept of the requirements for reunion; but the desire it contained for immediate intercommunion, while relegating doctrinal differences to a later consideration, precluded any successful result.¹⁴ A few years later, the condemnation of Anglican orders by Leo XIII aroused a new interest among the Orthodox regarding this vital question; but because the subject requires extensive particular consideration we will not consider the matter.¹⁵

¹⁰ Slosser, *op. cit.*, p. 246. ¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 247-49.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 274; *IKZ*, XI (1911), 475 f. ¹³ R. T. Davidson, *The Lambeth Conferences of 1867, 1878, and 1888* (London, 1889), pp. 273-75.

¹⁴ Athelstan Riley, *Birkbeck and the Russian Church* (London, 1917), pp. 2f.; 12-16.

¹⁵ For Orthodox writers on the question of Anglican orders, cf. A. Palmieri, *Theologia*

The Lambeth Conference of 1897 appointed the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London as a committee to confer either personally or by correspondence with the Orthodox Eastern Patriarchs, the Holy Governing Synod of the Church of Russia, and the chief authorities of the various Eastern Churches, with a view to the possibility of securing a clearer understanding and of establishing closer relations.¹⁶ Bishop Wordsworth of Salisbury, who was commissioned to convey the Lambeth resolution to the four Patriarchs, issued a short work containing statements on the teaching of the Anglican Church for the information of the Orthodox Greeks. It received a certain amount of approval in Greece, but the wording of the text was too indefinite to lead to any practical conclusions.¹⁷

The Holy Synod of Russia revealed a very definite attitude towards reunion, especially regarding the Anglicans, in a reply to an encyclical of Joachim III, the Patriarch of Constantinople, sent in 1902 to several of the Orthodox Churches.¹⁸ They had come to realise the diversity of doctrinal opinions within the Anglican community and therefore insisted that this diversity be obviated before any progress could be made.¹⁹ The Protestant Episcopal Church of America seemed to have the answer to this request. In 1903 their Commission on ecclesiastical relations sent Bishop Grafton of Fond du Lac to Russia to treat of closer relations between the two churches.²⁰ His visit lasted a month and resulted in the sending of a memorial to Metropolitan Antonius of St. Petersburg, which stressed the points of agreement in doctrine that warranted reunion. The document reveals a clear knowledge of the Russian position and manifests apparent readiness to make extensive concessions. But it seems that the Orthodox took it as a partial interpretation; for in 1904 they published some observations on the American Prayer Book which postulated

Dogmatica Orthodoxa, (Florence, 1913), II, p. 187, note 1; J. A. Douglas, *The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern-Orthodox, especially in regard to Anglican Orders* (London, 1921), pp. 188 ff.; A. Senaud, *Christian Unity: A Bibliography* (Geneva, 1937), pp. 12-16. ¹⁶ *The Six Lambeth Conferences: 1867-1920* (London, 1928), pp. 205-6.

¹⁷ John Wordsworth, *Some Points in the Teaching of the Church of England set forth for the information of the Orthodox Christians of the East in the form of an answer to questions* (London, 1900); *Revue internationale de théologie* (1901), p. 421.

¹⁸ *Échos d'orient*, V (1902), 243 ff.; VII (1904), 91 ff.

¹⁹ *Guardian*, Aug. 26, Sept. 2 (1903).

²⁰ *Échos d'orient*, VIII (1905), 138 ff.; *IKZ*, XVI (1916), 253 ff.

radical changes to bring it into conformity with Orthodox doctrine.²¹

Some rather disheartening incidents had made it evident to Anglican authorities that hopes of reunion lay with appeals directed to those in real authority among the Orthodox rather than to important individuals.²² The Lambeth Council of 1908 consequently resolved to communicate directly with the National Council of the Russian Church and to proceed in their dealings with members of the Orthodox Church only after a clear understanding of their status in that Church had been ascertained.²³

As a result of a World Missionary Conference held in Edinburgh in 1910, the General Convention of the American Protestant Episcopal Church appointed a committee to arrange a world-wide convention of churches for the consideration of questions of faith and order.²⁴ Mr. Robert Gardiner, the secretary, sent a circular letter on the subject to the metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops of the Russian dioceses in November, 1914. Of the several replies, the most interesting were the letters of Archbishop Antony of Kharkov, a very conservative Orthodox theologian. He declared that the failure of all past attempts at reunion was due to a difference of dogma, especially the dogma of the unicity of the church, which declared all other Churches to be heretical, so that reunion could mean only submission to the one true Church and to her teachings; he felt that Orthodox theologians who differed from him were not authentic.²⁵ Whatever obstacle this attitude may have placed in the way of further negotiations was removed by the political events which soon enveloped Russia.

After the war two conferences of some importance took place. In July, 1918, a Greek commission under the leadership of Monsignor Meletios Metaxakis left for America to attend to the affairs of the Greek Church there. In New York they were invited to hold conferences with members of the American Protestant Episcopal Church on some points of doctrine, chiefly on baptism, orders, and the *Filioque*; they accepted, and Metropolitan Metaxakis acted as spokesman in

²¹ *Russian Observations upon the American Prayer Book*, trans. W. J. Barnes, ed. W. H. Frere (London, 1917).

²² For these incidents, cf. *Revue internationale de théologie* (1906), pp. 181 ff.; (1907), p. 708 f.; M. d'Herbigny, *L'Anglicanisme et l'orthodoxie gréco-slave* (Paris, 1922), p. 61; *Échos d'orient*, XI (1908), 121. ²³ *The Six Lambeth Conferences*, p. 332.

²⁴ Slosser, *op. cit.*, p. 352. ²⁵ *IKZ*, XIX (1919), 238-44; 250 f.

making responses to the questions asked.²⁶ Several long discussions on these matters merely served to emphasize the fact that the differences were of such a nature that only a general assembly of both Churches could resolve them, though the outlook, they felt, was hopeful. The discussions were continued at Oxford the following November and later in London. As a result, the Greeks returned home feeling quite confident that union was possible, inasmuch as the Anglicans seemed to be rejecting Protestantism and drawing nearer to the Orthodox.²⁷

This rapid sketch of the more important contacts between Anglicans and Orthodox relating to doctrinal matters gives some idea of how long standing the problem of reunion has been and of the many efforts made to come to an understanding. The early period might be described as the attempt of individuals to solve the problem, at least from the Anglican side, while the subsequent period may be regarded as a sort of semi-official effort. There remains for consideration that most important time when the authoritative powers of the Churches began to work in a formal manner on the problem of reunion. Before proceeding to the exposition of this last phase, it will be well to examine and to indicate the relative status of each communion in regard to some of the more important points of doctrine that were discussed through the years we have outlined, in order to appreciate the degree of *rapprochement* attained.

DOCTRINES RELATED TO REUNION

The general attitude of the Greeks in their dealings with the Nonjurors was that of a communion which considered itself the one exclusively true Church, so that union with it meant that those who had lost the Oriental faith might recover it.²⁸ The Nonjurors were told to get rid of the prejudices which they inherited from the Luthe-

²⁶ Cf. *The Episcopal and Greek Churches: Report of an Unofficial Conference on Duty between Members of the Episcopal Church in America and His Grace Meletios Metaxakis, Metropolitan of Athens, and his Advisers, Oct. 26, 1918* (New York: Department of Missions and Church Extension of the Episcopal Church, 1920); W. C. Emhardt, *Historical Contact of the Eastern Orthodox and the Anglican Churches* (New York, 1920); *The Anglican and Eastern Churches Association: Sixth Report* (London, 1921); *Καὶνὴ Διδαχὴ*, Jan., ff. (1920), p. 44 ff.

²⁷ *Καὶνὴ Διδαχὴ*, pp. 101 ff.; *The Anglican and Eastern Churches Association: Sixth Report*, pp. 81 ff. ²⁸ Mansi, *op. cit.*, XXXVII, 415-16; 611.

Calvinists, and agree with the pious Oriental Church.²⁹ This the Nonjurors would not think of, because they felt themselves to be a distinct body of the Catholic Church, which would submit only to the decisions of the Scriptures and the primitive Fathers as a common standard of faith and worship.³⁰

However hopeless these mutual attitudes may have rendered the negotiations, there was continued discussion of particular beliefs. The Scriptures and tradition were placed on an equal plane by the Greeks, but the Nonjurors would not give the same value to tradition.³¹ Agreement was reached on the place of the bishop in the church, the Greeks making it clear that the infallibility of the church derived from the Holy Ghost operating through the instrumentality of the hierarchy; this is a point worth noting because of later Orthodox theories.³² Long arguments on both sides produced no agreement on the doctrine of the *Filioque*.³³ The doctrine of the sacraments was principally concerned with the Eucharist, which was explained by the Greeks in the terminology of transubstantiation;³⁴ but as this was anathema to the Nonjurors, there was no hope of agreement.³⁵ The Greeks labored to no avail to remove the fears of their friends regarding devotion to the Blessed Virgin and the saints and the veneration of images; for though they explained the distinctions of worship, the Nonjurors still wished to be excused from any such obligations.³⁶

The Russians whom Palmer encountered still clung tenaciously to the idea of the exclusive truth of the Eastern Church, considering the Anglicans as Protestants and Palmer's concept of the branch-theory as an anachronism.³⁷ They were not, however, as consistent in other matters: they had omitted the words "substance" and "accidents" in the matter of the Eucharist in their translation of the XVIII Articles of Bethlehem, and had excluded the deuterocanonical books from the canon of Holy Scripture.³⁸ More important, because of its weight with later reunionists, was a statement made by Khomiakoff, the Slavophile, to the effect that the infallibility of the church de-

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 453-54; 612.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 471-72(614); 489-90(622-23).

³¹ *Ibid.*, 425-26(611); 475-76(615).

³² *Ibid.*, 387-88(606); 551-56.

³³ *Ibid.*, 421-22(611); 378.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 441-44(612); 463-68(611).

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 389-92(608); 481-84(619).

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 389-90(607); 435-42(611); 475-480(615-16).

³⁷ Palmer, *A Visit*, pp. 132-33; 195; 218-19; 354-55. ³⁸ Shaw, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

pended, not on any hierarchical order, but on the totality of the whole people of the church.³⁹ This seemed a disturbing theory even to Palmer, who declared that, if put absolutely, it was a very mischievous error.⁴⁰ This episode sharpened Anglican interest in the East and gave to the Orthodox a clearer understanding of the claims of Anglicanism.

From this time on, the numerous conferences of groups from both Churches, whether lay people or bishops, strove to clarify or to justify the particular doctrines of their communion. The compromise wording used in the resolutions of the Bonn Conferences could not be considered as a definite statement from either side and was not received with satisfaction at home. It was not surprising, then, that the Lambeth Conference of 1888 expressed its desire that the Prayer Book with its Catechism, the Ordinal, and the Thirty-nine Articles be set before foreign Churches as the standards of Anglican doctrine and worship and that without modification.⁴¹ This unyielding attitude was reflected in the reply of the bishops to Platon. It insisted that each side more or less formally accept the other's position, with toleration for any points of difference; and thus the lack of any real progress towards theological harmony became clearly manifest.⁴² Such Orthodox leaders as Archbishop Antonius of Finland and V.A. Sokolov, the Russian theologian, were not slow in pointing out that the discrepancies in the formularies of faith were the precise obstacles that rendered reunion impossible.⁴³ The same conclusion was reached by Chrestos Androustos, the Greek theologian, in his dissertation on the validity of English ordinations, which was published in 1903.⁴⁴

The American Episcopal Church seemed ready to comply with the Orthodox demands. It declared mutual agreement on the doctrines of the church, the hierarchy, the priesthood, the conception of the sacraments as channels of grace, the communion of saints, and the mystery of the Blessed Sacrament; it attempted to give an harmonious explanation of some of the more objectionable Articles, of devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and of the procession of the Holy Ghost.⁴⁵ As we have seen, however, the implicit reply of the Russians was to de-

³⁹ Birkbeck, *op. cit.*, pp. 94 f.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 155.

⁴¹ Davidson, *op. cit.*, pp. 274 f.

⁴² Riley, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-16.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 163; pp. 283 ff.

⁴⁴ C. Androustos, *Τὸ Κῆρυξ τῶν Ἀγγλικῶν Χειροτονιῶν ἐξ ἐπιφύως ὀρθοδόξου* (Constantinople, 1903), pp. 82-83. ⁴⁵ *Échos d'orient*, VIII (1905), 138 ff.; *IKZ*, XVI (1916), 253 ff.

mand that this interpretation be confirmed by striking out all unorthodox words in the Prayer Book, cancelling the Thirty-nine Articles and the Protestant teaching of the Catechism on the sacraments, and relinquishing the doctrines of the *Filioque* and the sole sufficiency of Holy Scripture; regarding the other points changes were to be made in the proper liturgical books to conform with the Orthodox belief.⁴⁶

The subsequent years of this period brought no greater success. The efforts we have so far considered total up to a sum of investigations, attempts at satisfactory doctrinal explanation, and closer mutual acquaintance. Desire for reunion certainly increased, practical steps in the way of mutual concessions were multiplied, doctrinal agreement sometimes seemed closer, but the authority behind such agreement remained problematical. The realisation of the need for full authority in the negotiations brings us to the consideration of the new era.

THE OFFICIAL PERIOD

The initiative for the establishment of official relations was taken by Metropolitan Dorotheus of Brussa and *locum tenens* of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. In January, 1920, he issued an encyclical letter "Unto all the Churches of Christ wheresoever they be," appealing for closer intercourse and a mutual understanding between the Christian Churches.⁴⁷ Its purpose was, not to seek reunion directly, but to help in "preparing and facilitating the complete and blessed union which may some day be attained with God's help." Stressing the necessity of charity and mutual interest for accomplishing this understanding, it suggested, as practical means, the acceptance of a uniform calendar, the exchange of brotherly letters on Christian feasts, friendly intercourse everywhere between mutual representatives, exchange of theological students and works, the convening of pan-Christian conferences, the impartial examination of doctrinal differences, mutual respect of customs, and other practical manifestations of a similar nature. The results of this appeal were seen in a reunion conference that followed soon afterwards.

It was, in fact, during the early summer of the same year that Bishop Darlington of Harrisburg, who had been appointed chairman of the

⁴⁶ Cf. *supra*, note 21.

⁴⁷ G. K. A. Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity* (Oxford, 1924), pp. 44 ff.

Commission of the American Episcopal Church "to confer with the Eastern Orthodox and Old Catholic Churches," arrived with other members of the Commission at Constantinople. There, after a number of conferences with the Holy Governing Synod, a concordat was solemnly agreed upon as a working hypothesis in missionary fields, as a step towards unity and permanent intercommunion. This statement was entitled, "Terms of Agreement between Eastern Orthodox, Old Catholic, and Anglican Churches, proposed as a basis of Restoration of Corporate Unity and Intercommunion"; and it had the official approval of the parties concerned.⁴⁸

The extent of the agreement reached was perhaps less than the Americans had expected; for in 1919 "the bishops of the American Episcopal Church, who had recently visited the Near East, had pronounced that everything was ready for reunion of the two Churches, and had given it as their opinion that a formal proposal to the effect made by the Anglican Church would suffice to bring it about."⁴⁹ As a matter of fact the old difficulty of ambiguous terms still dominated the resolutions. They agreed that the "Catholic Church" was to be accepted as the authority for teaching the faithful what must be believed for salvation; but the relation of this authority to the "Catholic faith" of Scripture and tradition is not at all clear. The acceptance of the decrees of faith put forth by ecumenically accepted general councils did not determine which Councils were so accepted, while the approval of the sacraments as means of grace made no mention of their number, but approved of the sacramental acts of both Churches as true and valid; actual intercommunion in specific cases was to be determined by the local ecclesiastical authorities. Whatever questions might arise regarding the meaning of the resolutions would have to be determined finally by a truly ecumenical council.

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1920

The English side of the Anglican Church made its entrance into the field of official relationships when Archbishop Davidson of Canterbury sent a letter on March 4, 1920, to the *locum tenens*, Dorotheus, inviting

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 49; *The Christian East*, V (1924), 83-85; this review will be referred to as *CE*.

⁴⁹ "The Relations of The Constantinopolitan and Anglican Churches," *CE*, I (1920), 64-71; "The Mansfield Resolutions," *ibid.*, 84-85.

him to attend, or send a delegate to, the Lambeth Conference to be held in July, since it was to give a prominent place to the relations between the Church of England and the Orthodox Church of the East.⁵⁰ Constantinople gladly accepted and sent an official delegation to consult on relations; its members were Metropolitan Philaretus of Demotica, Professor Komnenos of Halki, the Archimandrite Pagonis of London, and the Archpriest Callinicos of Manchester.

Before considering the problems which the Orthodox delegation discussed with a special committee of Anglicans appointed for that purpose, it would be well to understand the mind of the Anglican bishops on the question of reunion as it was manifested in their own conference. This is best grasped from their ninth resolution, which was put under the form of an "Appeal to All Christian People."⁵¹ Beginning with the acknowledgment that "all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity" shared with them membership in the universal Church of Christ, which is His Body, the appeal went on to point out that Christ willed a Catholic Church which should be 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 union, it stated, was no longer visible, but the time had come to forget the past and to strive for a reunited Catholic Church in which all Christians should be gathered.

There were certain requirements which the appeal felt were necessary as fundamental points of agreement in order to attain such a reunited church. Among these were the acceptance of the Holy Scriptures as the rule and ultimate standard of faith, of the Nicene Creed as a sufficient statement of the faith, of the sacraments of baptism and Holy Communion, and of a divinely authoritative ministry, which the bishops felt could best be attained by episcopal consecration.

The Orthodox delegation met with a special committee, composed of a number of bodies of ten, presided over by Bishop Gore; their report gives us a clear idea of the subjects they discussed with the Anglicans and of their opinion on the results of the conferences.⁵² The delegation

⁵⁰ "Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Patriarch of Constantinople," *ibid.*, 57-58. ⁵¹ *The Six Lambeth Conferences*, pp. 26 ff. ⁵² Bell, *op. cit.*, pp. 52 ff.

first of all requested that the proceedings relating to the discussions held with the committee from Athens, under Meletios, and with the committees from Serbia and Rumania should be read, in order that they might be sure of what had been said recently on both sides; the subject matter of those conferences was then reviewed. Because of the fact that the Anglican members, being principally interested in intercommunion, seemed to "think that one should begin from deeds and actions, and then proceed to the principles and theories", it was necessary for the Orthodox members, on their part, to bring up questions regarding specific doctrines. They did this because they could not agree with the English views of the church, which allowed men differing from one another in faith, not in things indifferent and non-essential, to constitute one undivided whole, whereas the Orthodox churchmember "must accept the whole of our teaching, share canonically in the holy Sacraments, and believe in lawfully settled ecclesiastical principles." Hence they firmly concluded that "intercommunion without previous understanding and agreement regarding dogma and teaching is not the way which leads to a sure and safe union of the Christian Churches."⁵³

As a result of maintaining this viewpoint, the Orthodox succeeded in getting the Anglicans to agree with them on the necessity of dogmatic union that was to bring with it canonical and ready intercommunion; they then proceeded to discuss some particular points of doctrine. In regard to baptism as administered by English priests, the Orthodox felt that they could not accept its validity even by "economy," and requested that the direction of the Prayer Book which orders immersion should, if possible, be put in force. They would not declare for the validity of confirmation by Anglican bishops, so long as the question of the validity of Anglican orders had not been decided. The same reason, they repeated, would suspend their judgment regarding the Holy Eucharist. Moreover, they wished that the Anglicans would characterize the Eucharist as a sacrifice and propitiation and add the invocation of the Holy Spirit to the form as a necessary element. They did not insist on the use of the word transubstantiation, but declared that "change" or "transform" would suffice to indicate a real change.⁵⁴

The question of Anglican orders was taken up with the members of

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 57-58.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 59-61.

the Anglican Standing Committee, who tried to convince the Orthodox of their sacramental nature by arguments from the Book of Common Prayer; but the delegates would express no opinion on the matter until it had been examined by their own Church. For confirmation of the Anglican statements, they proposed that the Church of England should formulate definitely the number of the sacraments, accepting the fact that they are of divine institution, even though two of them had superiority.

The Orthodox idea of the church was explained in the conferences as being limited in its proper sense to the actual members of Orthodoxy, without asserting anything about the salvation of those outside its bosom. On the matter of creeds the Anglicans were requested to limit themselves to the Nicene Creed in their expression of faith, but the request was not hopefully received; neither would they reject the *Filioque*, which was defended by Father Puller's argument from Tarasius—an argument apparently accepted by the Orthodox as a valid reason for belief in the doctrine but not for an addition to the Creed.

When the general abolition of the Thirty-nine Articles was proposed, the president of the Standing Committee replied that this was possible, since they were really not articles of faith, but that it would actually be very difficult. Consequently, it was agreed that the Orthodox Standing Committee should undertake to suggest what alterations they thought would be necessary, not only in the Articles but also in the Prayer Book. Confession was barely touched upon and the Roman doctrine of purgatory was condemned by the Anglicans, who explained, however, that prayers and even requiems for the souls of the dead had become popular again among them and would even be publicly recommended by the Church in the revision of the Prayer Book.

In summing up, the report of the Orthodox delegates said: "We cannot conceal that we expected from them and from the full Lambeth Conference something better in relation to our affairs, and rather different from that which we now read in its published proceedings, and to which the Holy and Reverend Primate of England judges it right to direct our attention in his letter to the Reverend the Patriarchal Locum-Tenens."⁵⁵

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 70-75.

As a result of these conferences, the long endeavors towards an understanding which had been made by individual groups, now had a sort of authoritative sanction by official representatives. The progress in actual terms of agreement was not, as is evident, very substantial, but it would be well to recapitulate some of its important features. We find, first of all, a reversion to the strict interpretation of the Orthodox canons on baptism, which leads the Orthodox to refuse acknowledgment of the validity of Anglican baptism, while confirmation, as administered by Anglican bishops, was made to depend on the validity of Anglican orders.⁵⁶ Though the Greeks remained faithful to the doctrine of the propitiatory sacrifice and the necessity of the Epiclesis, they yielded more than others had done in abandoning the word "transubstantiation." They seemed to go beyond Sokolov's deductions, which had been the most favorable up to that time, on the value of the Ordinal in determining the validity of Anglican orders; for whereas he concluded that without an explicit statement from the Anglican hierarchy that they considered orders a sacrament the Ordinal was insufficient,⁵⁷ this delegation implied that the Prayer Book could supply such a declaration. They did, however, desire the Church of England to declare the divine institution of the seven sacraments. Their insistence on the acceptance of the Seventh Ecumenical Council was exceptionally rigid, but they were not so definite as their predecessors on claiming exclusive rights as the Church proper. Outstanding was the Greek concession that the doctrine contained in the *Filioque* could be held, as the Russians had long previously admitted; but they still would not allow its admission to the Creed. The Anglican ideas were not more advanced than previous individual interpretations had been, but the section of Anglican thought which sought reunion was becoming more prominent.

On receiving the report of the delegation, the Synod of Constantinople instructed its Standing Committee to prepare a memorandum on the validity of Anglican ordinations.⁵⁸ Meanwhile, Anglicans who realized the necessity of manifesting to the Orthodox a closer agreement in doctrine, if there was to be recognition of their orders or in-

⁵⁶ Archbishop Germanos, "Progress Towards the Reunion of the Orthodox and Anglican Churches," *CE*, X (1929), 20-31. ⁵⁷ Cf. Riley, *op. cit.*, pp. 283 ff.

⁵⁸ "Constantinople and Anglican Ordinations," *CE*, III (1922) 100-110.

tercommunion, published a document entitled, "Suggested Terms of Intercommunion between the Church of England and the Eastern Orthodox Church by a Theologian of the English Church."⁵⁹ This was a private statement issued for consideration at the request of the Eastern Churches Committee as a sort of *ballon d'essai*, though it was afterwards, to the embarrassment of its promoters, printed in Orthodox reviews as authoritative.⁶⁰ There is nothing to signalize in this document; for other individual groups had gone equally far in their attempts to find a common terminology, and some had gone farther; but it does show a sort of common denominator maintained on the points known to be disputed. Thus, tradition would be accepted in the limited sense of a guide; the Nicene Creed would be the only absolutely necessary profession of faith; the *Filioque* would be maintained where customary; the title of sacrament was to be given to seven rites, but local custom was to determine their usage; the doctrine of the Eucharist was left inexact; holy orders by episcopal ordination as an historical fact would be continued in their present form; and, finally, the use of icons would be left to custom. The document was published without comment in all the Greek ecclesiastical papers; this, as Canon Douglas said, "was because the elucidatory questions, which, if laid on the table at a formal discussion it must provoke, would certainly expose fundamental differences."⁶¹

Another very important effort to induce the Orthodox to recognize Anglican orders and to gain some limited form of intercommunion was made in May, 1921, by Canon J. A. Douglas, who published a book entitled, *The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern Orthodox*.⁶² In this work, the author presented the possibilities of Orthodox recognition according to their theory of "economy," and urged a declaration of faith according to the conditions Androutsos had laid down in his study of the question.⁶³ Canon Douglas' effort

⁵⁹ *CE*, I (1920), 146-150.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, II (1921), 179-80.

⁶¹ "The E.C.U. Declaration," *ibid.*, III (1922), 49-63.

⁶² Cf. *supra*, note 15.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 55-72. The theory of "economy" is held by many Orthodox theologians; in its explanation and application they differ among themselves. For our purpose it is sufficient to state: "Consistit autem theoria vel potius praxis 'oeconomiae' in hoc, quod ecclesia sacramentum aliquod, quod *κατ' ἀκρίβειαν* (ex rigore dogmatis vel juris; secundum accuratam principiorum observantiam) omnino nullum erat, tamen per quandam *οικονομίαν* (indulgentiam, compositionem, dispensationem) ut verum sacramentum agnoscere et

had a profound influence on subsequent events, as we shall see, but its special subject matter precludes analysis here.

The committee appointed at Constantinople to study the question of Anglican orders completed its task early in 1921, and the substance of the report was published that summer by Professor Komnenos of Halki, under the title *Anglican Ordinations*.⁶⁴ This statement, which expressed conviction as to the validity of the orders, according to the Orthodox theory of "economy," was based on belief in their Apostolic transmission through correct canonical observance and sacramental doctrine, which doctrine was contained in the Ordinal, especially the Preface. Any difficulty coming from the Thirty-nine Articles was removed by considering them as merely historical data, while the doubt about the meaning of sacrifice in Anglican thought was settled by the answer of the English archbishops to the papal bull of 1897, and by the general doctrine of the great English theologians.⁶⁵ The report then recommended that Constantinople recognize the true priesthood of the Anglican Church. This was a very marked advance in Orthodox opinion, since preceding studies had always held that the Anglican formularies were insufficient in themselves to prove the correct notion of the priesthood and the Eucharistic sacrifice, and, therefore, wished an explicit declaration on the matter, whereas Komnenos was satisfied with the formularies and a sectional interpretation of them.

The idea of a declaration of faith, as suggested by Canon Douglas,⁶⁶ was acted upon by the Eastern Church Union, which published such a declaration in the *Church Times* of May 26, 1922.⁶⁷ Developed along the lines of the previous "Terms of Intercommunion,"⁶⁸ it did

accipere potest. Quam ecclesiae potestatem partim in eo fundant, quod ecclesia sit divinae gratiae depositaria et sacramentorum gubernatrix, partim ex aliquorum Patrum dictis . . . putare videntur *ecclesiam posse aliquando verum sacramentum agnoscere* et sua potestate supplere, *ubi in rei veritate nullum omnino sacramentum erat, sed merum signum materiale*. . . Dicunt insuper ad ecclesiam pertinere, ut diiudicet, quandonam *ακρίβεια*, quando *δικονομία* sit adhibenda, eamque hac in re circumstantias respicere et bonum commune ecclesiae vel saltem maioris mali evitacionem prae oculis habere" (Theophilus Spácil, S.J., *Doctrina Theologiae Orientalis Separati De Sacramentis in Genere* [Rome, 1937], pp. 121-22; cf. Hiéromeine Pierre, "Économie ecclésiastique et réitération des sacrements," *Irenikon*, XIV [1937], 228-47; 339-62).

⁶⁴ CE, II (1921), 51. ⁶⁵ *Loc. cit.* ⁶⁶ Cf. *supra*, note 15. ⁶⁷ Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

⁶⁸ Cf. *supra*, note 59.

not advance beyond the statements of previous party groups; nevertheless, it met with sharp criticism from other Anglicans, some of whom drafted a counterdeclaration which seems to have reached Constantinople.⁶⁹ The desired effect, however, was obtained, for on July 28, 1922, the Holy Synod of Constantinople passed a resolution recognizing the validity of Anglican ordinations.⁷⁰ The formal document was delivered to Dr. Emhardt of the American Protestant Episcopal Church, who was in Constantinople at the time. He carried the letter to London, where it was given to the Archbishop and later sent by the Metropolitan Germanos to the *Church Times* for publication.⁷¹ The decision made it clear that there was no question of a decree by the whole Orthodox Church but merely of the Church of Constantinople, which placed the orders on an equal footing with those of the Roman, Old Catholic, and Armenian Churches.

In order that the mind of the whole Orthodox Church might be known, the Ecumenical Patriarch in August, 1922, sent an encyclical to the other autocephalous Churches, announcing the decision and the reasons on which it was based and asking them to give their opinion on the matter. The only immediate result was the acceptance of Anglican orders by Damianos, Patriarch of Jerusalem, in a letter of February 27, 1923, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and by Cyril, Patriarch of Cyprus, who wrote to the same effect to the Patriarch of Constantinople on March 7, 1923, adding that his approval did not carry with it the permission of indiscriminate sacramental relations.⁷² The haste of the whole affair left regrets on both sides.⁷³

The doubts that still remained among the Orthodox concerning Anglican doctrine were manifested by members of the Holy Synod of Athens in the questions which they put to Bishop Gore, chairman of the Eastern Churches Relations Committee, on the occasion of his visit to Athens in the summer of 1923. The first question of a leading member was: "Do you, or do you not, regard the Holy Eucharist as

⁶⁹ *CE*, III (1922), 107.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, XV (1935), 44. Canon Douglas had promoted the declaration of faith at the suggestion of Komnenos, who assured him that thus his commission would certainly advise the Ecumenical Patriarch and his Synod to declare the validity of Anglican orders.

⁷¹ W. C. Emhardt, "Report to the National Council on a Visit to the Churches of Europe and the Near East," *CE*, IV (1923), 172-77.

⁷² Bell, *op. cit.*, pp. 97-99.

⁷³ *CE*, XV (1935), 46.

a sacrifice in the Church of England?" The Bishop assured them that the real teaching of the Church of England held that the Eucharist is a sacrifice. Other questions on the Anglican idea of the church and their attitude to other Protestants made the Bishop realize that greater knowledge on both sides was necessary.⁷⁴

A similar attitude was reflected in the reply of the Rumanian Synod to the encyclical of the Ecumenical Patriarch in January, 1925. They considered that the wide and undefined theories of the Anglican Church made it imperative that a more precise understanding should be reached with the Orthodox before any final pronouncement on the validity or non-validity of their orders could be made. Their main difficulty was with the sacramental concept of orders as manifested in the Articles, which left an ambiguity that ought to be removed by a clear statement from the Anglican Church in explanation of its doctrine. Hence they would not be satisfied with a statement from one section of Anglicanism.⁷⁵

The reluctance of many Orthodox to accept the Anglican position was demonstrated by a striking incident. On December 25, 1927, the Serbian Patriarch, Vladiko Dmitri, gave Holy Communion with his own hand to eight prominent Anglicans during the celebration of the Divine Liturgy in the Cathedral at Belgrade, despite the fact that the Council, when consulted, had unanimously pronounced against the action.⁷⁶ When the news was spread abroad, there were various adverse comments among the Orthodox. In Alexandria, *Pantainos* remarked that the Patriarch had pushed "economy" too far and that nothing could justify his act;⁷⁷ *Ekklesia* of Athens asked if the Metropolitan had not obeyed the suggestions of Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev, President of the Russian Synod of Carlowicz, who after his last visit to England had so radically changed his attitude to Anglicans.⁷⁸ *Pravda*, complaining of the act, asserted that no one could resolve the problem between the two Churches until the Anglicans, in a manner sanctioned by the entire church in assembly, had renounced the

⁷⁴ W. A. Wigram, "Athens Letter," *ibid.*, IV (1923), 156-7.

⁷⁵ "Report of His Holiness Mgr. Nectarie, Archbishop of Cernauti and Metropolitan, to the Holy Synod of the Patriarchate of Roumania," trans. J. Douglas and L. Patterson, *ibid.*, XII (1931), 6-26.

⁷⁶ *Échos d'orient*, XXVI (1927), pp. 341 ff. ⁷⁷ Jan. 19, 1928.

⁷⁸ Feb. 11, 1928.

differences that keep them apart from the Orthodox. *Vesnik* approved this standpoint and added a few words of its own against the act.⁷⁹

THE LAUSANNE CONFERENCE OF 1927

We might say that by this time the progress in doctrinal agreement between Anglicans and Orthodox had reached a point at which there were increasingly larger numbers of influential persons in both communions who had arrived at a mutual understanding, at least verbally, on many of the long-disputed points of theological belief, while there still remained other large groups in disagreement on the same points. This fact was well illustrated by the events which took place at the World Conference of Faith and Order held at Lausanne in August, 1927. Although this Conference was not directly concerned with Anglican and Orthodox relations, the participation of these two Churches in an effort which planned and discussed ways and means of furthering the reunion of all Churches naturally brought forth from their representatives expressions on the problem of reunion which would apply to their own mutual endeavor. Out of a representative body of 500 delegates from the various Churches, there were fifty-two Anglicans and twenty Orthodox.⁸⁰

The method of procedure was for chosen delegates to read an address before the plenary session on the subject which was to be under discussion that day; some discussion was then held in the presence of all, after which the subject was committed to a smaller group or section. In the section, after discussion and approval by at least a majority, a report was drawn up on the subject; it was then twice presented for further discussion to the plenary session of the Conference, which finally referred it to the various Churches as a report entitled "Documents Received by the Conference for Transmission to the Churches."⁸¹

The difficulties for the Orthodox began in the discussion and preparation of the reports by the various sections appointed for that purpose. As was to be expected in a conference where such diametrically opposed groups of religionists were striving to arrive at a common denominator

⁷⁹ Dec. 29, 1927; Jan. 22, 1928, cited in *Union des églises*, (1928), pp. 494-96.

⁸⁰ J. A. Douglas, "The World Conference on Faith and Order," *CE*, VIII (1927), 101-120.

⁸¹ *Faith and Order: Proceedings of the World Conference* (London, 1927), pp. 459 ff.

on points of Christian belief, there was much compromise and ambiguity in the use of terms. The Protestant groups dominated, and the best the individual Orthodox groups could do in the sectional meetings was to register their opinion in a footnote to the report. When, however, the reports began to be presented to the *plenum* of the Conference for approbation as fundamental agreements within the Conference, the Orthodox realized that they could not accept them, even though a note were added to express their opinion, without being compromised and later condemned by their home authorities.⁸²

Accordingly, after the preliminary reports of the first five topics had been presented, the Orthodox, represented by Metropolitan Germanos, made a declaration to the Conference.⁸³ They explained that they had always willingly co-operated in the movement and were anxious for its success, but that conscience forbade them to approve any of the reports, except that on the "Message of the Church," which was based on the teaching of Holy Scripture. The reports on the "Nature of the Church" and the "Common Confession of Faith" were, they maintained, contrary to the fundamental principles of Orthodoxy; for, whereas the basis of those reports was a verbal compromise between conflicting ideas and meanings, for them two different meanings in matters of faith could not be covered by the same words of a generally agreed statement. Hence there could be no compromise on the necessity of tradition as a source of revelation, on the acceptance of the Seven Ecumenical Councils, and on the doctrine of the seven sacraments as held in the Orthodox Church. Since, then, without total acceptance of the faith there could be for them no *communio in sacris*, the most they could do was to co-operate with the other Churches in the social and moral spheres.

The Anglican delegation decide that they, as a body, would make no declaration regarding the attitude of the Orthodox.⁸⁴ However, the reaction of the Bishop of Gloucester, Dr. Headlam, is worth noting, because it was he who, with Dr. Brightman, had drawn up the "Terms of Intercommunion" at the request of the Eastern Churches Committee in 1921. In his mind, the statement by the Orthodox would

⁸² Archbishop Germanos, "The Orthodox Delegation at Lausanne and its Declaration," *CE*, IX (1928), 9-15.

⁸³ *Faith and Order*, pp. 383-85.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 412-13.

make any sort of Christian reunion impossible: it amounted to saying, "This is what we believe, what we always have believed, what we always will believe, and we will make no change." He assailed this position as untenable according to the doctrine of the Council of Chalcedon, which, he maintained, limited essential and necessary beliefs to the matter contained in the creed of Nicea-Constantinople. Any attempt to force the acceptance by others of the Orthodox doctrine on the sacraments, and in particular on the ministry, he rejected as both historically and doctrinally unsound. Nevertheless, he did not feel that the situation was hopeless, because the Orthodox attitude really was an attempt to conceal uncertainty.⁸⁵ His statements are a helpful indication for the interpretation of the "Terms of Agreement"; and, if taken with the opinion which he gave at the Conference, on the irregularity of all orders, they reveal the possibility of unsuspected meanings underlying Anglican assertions.⁸⁶

These frank observations by the Anglican Bishop did not destroy the hopes of those Orthodox who had been in close touch with the Anglicans and had long understood how great were the differences of opinion on religious faith within the one communion. Thus the Metropolitan Germanos, who defended the Orthodox doctrine on the sacraments and the priesthood on the grounds of the teaching of tradition,⁸⁷ told the Anglican Congress at Cheltenham in 1928 that the sincere efforts of those members of the Anglican Church who had struggled to save the Catholic element in the Church might finally prevail over the whole body and so make reunion possible; meanwhile the Orthodox could help in such an evolution.⁸⁸

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1930

What seemed like an ideal opportunity to carry out such a plan of co-operation came with the invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cosmo Lang, to the Patriarch Photios of Constantinople, requesting him to send delegates to the Lambeth Conference of 1930.⁸⁹ There

⁸⁵ Bishop Headlam, "The Lausanne Conference and the Orthodox Eastern Church," *CE*, VIII (1927), 186-89.

⁸⁶ *Faith and Order*, p. 333.

⁸⁷ Cf. *supra*, note 82.

⁸⁸ Archbishop Germanos, "Progress towards the Reunion of the Orthodox and the Anglican Churches," *CE*, X (1929), 20-30.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, XI (1930), 64-66.

was a ready acceptance on the part of the Orthodox, who sent an imposing group, mostly bishops, representing the Churches of Alexandria, Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem, Yugo-Slavia, Rumania, Cyprus, Greece, Bulgaria, and Poland.⁹⁰

After the reception ceremonies were over, the delegates were invited to attend a preliminary private conference in the Jerusalem Chamber of Westminster Abbey with the Archbishop's Eastern Churches Committee, under the chairmanship of Bishop Gore. The Bishop there informed them that the Anglicans were not prepared to enter into discussions about doctrinal and sacramental differences, nor into the question of putting intercommunion into effect by "economy," but wished to engage themselves on the one subject of sacramental relations between Orthodox faithful and Anglican priests in America, in the case, often realized, of the absence of Orthodox priests.⁹¹ The Rumanian Archbishop Nectarie, however, had informed the Orthodox delegates that he had definite instructions to raise the question of Anglican orders and to demand categorical answers from the Lambeth Conference to the questions formulated in the Rumanian reply to the Ecumenical Patriarch in 1925.⁹² Hence Meletios, in reply to Bishop Gore, presented those questions anew; they became known as the "Rumanian Thesis."

To relieve the embarrassment created by this turn of events, Canon Douglas suggested that each side formulate a set series of questions on which the procedure of the official conferences might be based.⁹³ This was done and the following questions were submitted:

Orthodox: (1) Are the Terms of Intercommunion drawn up and published under the auspices of the Archbishop's Eastern Churches Committee regarded by the Committee of the Lambeth Conference as expressing the mind of the Anglican Church, and, if not, where and in what do they diverge from that mind?

2) What is the supreme constitutional body in the Anglican Church which decides authoritatively in the matter of the differences of Faith?

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 66-69.

⁹¹ "The Patriarch Meletios on the Delegation's Visit," trans. J. A. Douglas from *Pantinos*, Dec. 11 and 18, 1930, *CE*, XI (1930-31), 181-92; *Irenikon*, VIII (1931), 251. Canon Douglas said that they had decided not to raise the question of Anglican orders unless the Orthodox themselves brought it up. Cf. J. A. Douglas, "The Church of England Delegation to Roumania," *CE*, XV (1935), 40-57.

⁹² *Loc. cit.*

⁹³ *Irenikon*, VIII (1931), 253.

3) If a member of the Anglican Church utter publicly opinions contrary to the Faith of the Church, what is his status in the Church and how is it decided?

4) Does the Anglican Church agree that Holy Orders is a mysterion and that in its unbroken succession it is a link with the Apostles?

5) Does it agree that the Bread and Wine become the Body and Blood of Christ and that the rendering of the Eucharist is a spiritual sacrifice propitiatory for the living and the dead?⁹⁴

Anglican: (1) Will the recognition of Anglican Ordinations come before the other branches of the Orthodox Church which have not yet decided anything on this subject? Is there still need for other explanations in regard to that?

2) Does the Orthodox Church admit the validity of Anglican Baptism?

3) What position does the Orthodox Church intend to take each time that the celebration of the sacraments is effected by Anglican priests, in the case of the absence of an Orthodox priest and vice versa?

4) In view of the conduct of Anglican Bishops in the United States of America, what measures will be taken for the unification of the Orthodox Church in that country?

5) Has the Orthodox Church examined the 'conditions of Intercommunion' published in English, Greek, and Russian?

6) Would the Orthodox Church agree to the appointment of a Joint Commission which would examine questions of dogma?

7) Could the Anglican Church aid the Orthodox Church in the organisation of educational institutions, as for example, higher schools, in countries subject to the Orthodox Church?

8) What position will the Orthodox Church take before the Christian Association of Youth?⁹⁵

When these questions had been approved by both sides, the official conferences began between the Anglican sub-committee of bishops, composed of fourteen members from the various Anglican Churches, and the Orthodox delegates; Bishop Headlam acted as the chairman of the conferences. At the beginning of the first meeting the sixth Anglican question regarding the appointment of a joint commission to examine questions of doctrine was presented and agreed upon, since it was felt there was not enough time then to enter into many difficult points of doctrine.⁹⁶ Coming then to the first Orthodox question con-

⁹⁴ *Report of the Joint Doctrinal Commission appointed by the Oecumenical Patriarch and the Archbishop of Canterbury for Consultation on Points of Agreement and Difference between the Anglican and the Eastern Orthodox Churches* (London, 1932), pp. 56-72; this will be referred to as *Report of Joint Commission*.

⁹⁵ Hiéromoine Pierre, "La délégation orthodoxe à Lambeth," *Irénikon*, VIII (1931), 262-64, from the French.

⁹⁶ *Report of Joint Commission*, pp. 55-6.

cerning the mind of the Anglican Church on the "Terms of Intercommunion" of 1921, the Anglican bishops agreed that they were not inconsistent with the mind and doctrine of the Anglican Church; whereupon it was arranged that they be referred to the proposed joint commission for discussion.⁹⁷ On the matter of authoritative decisions of faith, the Anglicans stated that the whole body of bishops, without excluding the co-operation of the clergy and laity, gives the authentic interpretation; this seemed to the Orthodox to be about the same as their position. The all-important Rumanian Thesis regarding holy orders was answered by the Anglican bishops in some detail. They defended orders as a *mysterion* on the grounds that a special *charisma* is given to the person ordained, as indicated in the words of the form. The Preface of the Ordinal, they said, sufficiently indicated their belief in the apostolicity of orders. Though baptism and the Holy Eucharist were considered sacraments in a special sense in the Anglican Church, it was asserted that the formulae for the ordination of a priest and a bishop manifest the meaning of an outward visible sign of a spiritual gift given.⁹⁸

The Patriarch Meletios, however, still had some doubts about the meaning of these forms because of the Articles and because of the recognition of apostolic succession in the Church of Sweden by the Lambeth Conference of 1920. To his first difficulty, Bishop Headlam replied by declaring that the words of the Ordinal were the final interpretation, and to his second, by pointing out that, according to the "Appeal to All Christian People," it was not considered their duty to deny the spiritual value of ministries outside their own communion.⁹⁹ If nonconformist ministers were to enter the Anglican Church in a body, they would not be re-ordained, but eventually episcopal ordination would become the custom of the united church; to the Patriarch this appeared to be a practice of "economy."

Bishop Headlam partially satisfied the Orthodox difficulties with Anglican Eucharistic doctrine by explaining that the teaching of the Catechism and the Articles on this point had been formulated in opposition to materialistic theories of Latin divines, but that Anglican Liturgies confirmed the doctrine of the Real Presence, so that after Communion they regarded the consecrated elements as the Body and

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 57-60.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

Blood of Christ.¹⁰⁰ The answer of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to Leo XIII's encyclical on Anglican ordinations was again offered as their best statement on the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

The ensuing discussions were principally concerned with practical matters which need not be mentioned here. Upon conclusion, a resumé was approved by both sides to be presented for decision to competent bodies of each Church. The Orthodox delegation, being satisfied with the statements it had received purposed to make a unanimous recommendation to the authorities of the Orthodox autocephalous Churches to declare the acceptance as valid of Anglican ordinations, but desired that the plenum of the Lambeth Conference should formally implement the statements made to it.¹⁰¹ Canon Douglas urged the delegation not to press for the implementation; for he feared that the Orthodox might delay the final decision indefinitely, or the authorities of one or more of the autocephalous Churches might not implement the delegation's recommendation, whereas, if Lambeth gave its approval, "The Anglican Communion would have answered those questions satisfactorily in the minds of the accredited delegates of the whole Orthodox church; that fact would have been proclaimed to the world. That the Anglican church should be kept waiting for the final decision. . . would not be conducive to the furtherance of the Orthodox-Anglican approach; . . . the risk of the Anglican Communion being kept, as it were, standing on the doormat was not attractive."¹⁰² Nevertheless, the delegation decided that the risk must be taken, as the Rumanian Patriarch and his Synod "had stipulated that the answers to their questions should be from the totality of the Anglican Episcopate."¹⁰³ As a result the Conference wrote in a resolution, which, though indicating the Conference's inability to define doctrine, recorded its acceptance of the statements made by the Anglican bishops as a sufficient account of the teaching and practice of the Church of England and of the Churches in communion with it, in relation to those subjects.¹⁰⁴

Some indication of the value of this apparently very great progress towards agreement can be gathered from the comments of interested parties. Thus, the Metropolitan Nectarie, in his report to the Ru-

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 53-4; 64-5.

¹⁰¹ *CE*, XV (1935), 52.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 53.

¹⁰³ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁰⁴ *Report of Joint Commission*, p. 45.

manian Synod, concluded that though great progress had been made, there was a long way to go before reunion could be achieved.¹⁰⁶ Meletios' report to the Alexandrian Synod placed particular emphasis on the implementation given to the Resumé by the Lambeth Conference which he interpreted as meaning that the statements made by the Anglican bishops were, in the mind of the Conference, a "genuine account" of the teaching and practice of the Church of England.¹⁰⁶ There were, however, difficulties in the dogmatic situation in the Anglican Church, which was torn between Protestantism and Catholicism; this made it difficult for the Anglican bishops to make a clear statement of doctrine. Again, the limitation of Anglican teaching by the law of the national government he observed to be a particular difficulty to reunion with the Church of England. From the Orthodox side, he presented the difficulties caused by the lack of an official confession of faith, by the national rivalries among the Churches, and by the general conviction of the Orthodox laity that Anglicanism and Protestantism were one and the same thing. But he accepted the Anglican thesis of their orthodoxy and was prepared to overcome the obstacles that stood in the way of reunion.¹⁰⁷

Another prelate of Alexandria was far more severe in his judgments of the discussions. This was Metropolitan Christophorus of Leontopolis, who wrote a series of articles on the subject in the Athens review *Ekklesia*. He remarked that the Orthodox delegation felt that the Anglican propositions could serve as a useful basis of discussion only after certain modifications; that the uncondemned doctrines of the Bishop of Birmingham were an open scandal; that the Anglican conception of orders was not at all clear; and that their doctrine on the Eucharist was not free from Calvinism. Other points which had not been settled were the nature of tradition and its value, the addition of the *Filioque*, the number of the sacraments, the worship of images, the Protestant tendency of certain of the Thirty-nine Articles. Finally, it would be too much for Orthodoxy to unite with the Anglicans

¹⁰⁶ Cf. note 75. He is reported to have stated privately that the Orthodox ought to seek only a simple *rapprochement* and not union with the Anglicans, because the differences were too great; cf. *Irenikon*, VIII (1931), 267.

¹⁰⁶ *CE*, XI (1930-31), 185. Canon Douglas preferred to translate this as "a generally accurate account and not an exactly accurate account."

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 188-92.

with their present concept of the nature of the church; nevertheless, he felt that there were hopes.¹⁰⁸

These criticisms were augmented by other Orthodox writers in the same vein, whose opinions need not be elaborated here.¹⁰⁹ More important are the statements of the Archbishop Germanos, who had taken such an active part in the *rapprochement* of the two Churches. In a lecture delivered during the Anglo-Catholic Pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 1933, he revealed that there was a great discrepancy between the Anglican and Orthodox concepts of final authority in the matter of doctrine and a great misunderstanding in the attempt to extend the Orthodox notion of "economy" to the Anglican attitude towards non-episcopal ministries. The vital question of the Real Presence, which had apparently been agreed upon, was really, he explained, made a matter of personal opinion for the Anglicans because of the fact that the report of the Eastern Churches Committee to the Conference substituted for the words "Body and Blood of Christ," in referring to the consecrated elements, the words "the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ," thus allowing an ambiguous meaning. The fundamental difficulty to reunion, as he saw it, was the presence of these Protestant influences in the Anglican Church.¹¹⁰

The Protestant element had in fact made its attitude known in a letter to the *Guardian* of May 1, 1931. This protest of forty prominent Low Church Anglicans criticised the ambiguous use of the Catechism and Articles in the Resumé regarding the doctrine of the Eucharist, which they declared represented the opinion of only one party in the church and was not official Anglican doctrine; this should be sought for in the Thirty-nine Articles themselves.¹¹¹ The English *Churchman* of August 30, 1930, said that "there is grave reason to fear that the Committee of Bishops. . . did not accurately represent to their visitors the true doctrine of the Church of England."¹¹² There was, then, dissatisfaction in sections of both communions with the attempts at harmonizing doctrine which had been made at the Conference.

¹⁰⁸ *Irénikon*, VIII (1931), 266.

¹⁰⁹ R. Janin, "Les Orthodoxes à la Conférence de Lambeth," *Échos d'orient*, XXX (1931), 197-211.

¹¹⁰ Metropolitan Germanos, "Towards Reunion," *CE*, XIV (1933), 8-29.

¹¹¹ E. C. Messenger, *The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood* (London, 1937), II, pp. 650-51, citing *Guardian*, May 1st, 1931.

¹¹² *Loc. cit.*

The very important element of official approval of the agreements by the Conference, which seemed to mark them as vastly more important and more valuable than anything which had ever been accomplished previously, turns out upon analysis to be a matter of very dubious significance. The reason for this has been shown to lie in the fact that the authority of the bishops of the Church of England in matters of faith is limited by the final decision of Parliament. This was evidenced in the debate over the revision of the Prayer Book when "the supremacy of Parliament over the Church was repeatedly and vigorously asserted by members, and never once questioned."¹¹³ Hence, the approval given by the Conference to the Committee's interpretation of the nature of holy orders and the apostolic succession, even with the cautious safeguard that it was a "sufficient" account of Anglican teaching, could be nullified if Parliament decreed that the Book of Common Prayer should be interpreted by the Articles.¹¹⁴ On the other hand, the teaching of the Prayer Book on orders has been interpreted in quite a different sense from that given in the Resumé by other writers, such as the Bishop E. A. Knox, D.D.¹¹⁵ In the same way, the statements made regarding the Eucharistic sacrifice and the Real Presence are weakened by the knowledge that in the debates in Parliament over the reformed Prayer Book in 1928, it was universally agreed that no Book which admitted the Real Presence in such a manner that the species after consecration are adorable should be approved; hence it rejected that Book which had made provisions for reservation, on the grounds that reservation necessarily implies adoration and a real change in the element of the bread, so that it no longer remains bread.¹¹⁶ The idea of sacrifice as expressed in the Answer of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to Leo XIII's encyclical on Anglican ordinations was another point to which many members of Parliament objected, asserting that the teaching of a definite sacrifice and not merely a commemorative service was contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England; the House of Commons agreed, in substance at least, with this objection.¹¹⁷

Summing up the dogmatic agreements reached in the light of the

¹¹³ Bernard Leeming S.J., "A Note on the Report of the Joint Doctrinal Commission between the Anglican and the Eastern Orthodox Church," *Gregorianum*, XIII (1932), 541.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 552.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 553-5.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 565-6.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 567-8.

foregoing considerations, we can perceive that the doctrine on the authority in the church, as accepted by both sides, though it seems to have been the common opinion among Anglican bishops, can scarcely be justified as the official teaching of the Church of England; that the doctrine on holy orders, and on the Eucharist as a sacrament and a sacrifice was accepted with reservations by the Orthodox delegation and was approved by the Lambeth Conference only as a permissible doctrine in the Anglican Church. The real progress towards dogmatic harmony consisted in the increased number and importance of Anglicans who were willing to agree verbally with the particular Orthodox doctrines under discussion and a correspondingly larger section of Orthodox who were ready to accept to some extent such agreement. The immediate practical result of the Conferences was the recognition of Anglican orders by the Patriarchate of Alexandria. The letter of Meletios announcing this fact to the Archbishop of Canterbury made it clear that the Holy Synod came to its decision because the Lambeth Conference had approved the declarations of the Anglican bishops as a *genuine* account of the teaching and practice of the Church of England on the dogmatic points discussed.¹¹⁸ Although the Ecumenical Patriarch, Photios, wrote to the other autocephalous Churches urging them to make a similar pronouncement, nothing was done about it.¹¹⁹

THE JOINT DOCTRINAL COMMISSION OF 1931

On October 15, 1931, in accordance with the agreement reached in the Lambeth Conferences of 1930, the Joint Doctrinal Commission of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches met in London to discuss the "Terms of Intercommunion" which had been drafted in 1921 by Bishop Headlam and Dr. Brightman as a *ballon d'essai* and circulated to "provoke discussion."¹²⁰ There were eight Orthodox members representing by official appointment nine autocephalous Churches. Neither the Russian nor the Bulgarian Church was represented, because the Ecumenical Patriarch felt unable to communicate with the authorities of the "schismatic" Bulgarians, while the persecution in Russia prevented representation of that single branch of the Russian Church which he would recognize; the Archbishop of Canterbury took pains to express his displeasure at this fact.¹²¹ The Bishop of Gloucester again

¹¹⁸ *CE*, XII (1931), 1-4. ¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 5-6. ¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, XII (1931-32), 121. ¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 118.

acted as chairman, while the rest of the Anglican group was composed of the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishops of Gibraltar, Fulham, and North Indiana, Professors Goudge and Grenstead, both from Oxford, Canon J. A. Douglass, and the Secretary, the Rev. P. Usher.¹²²

At the opening meeting the Archbishop of Canterbury gave a welcoming address, calling attention to the purpose of the Commission, viz., to prepare a joint statement on the theological points about which there was difference and agreement between the two Churches, hinting that there was no need to go over again what had been summed up in the Resumé of 1930, except by more complete statements, and, finally, hoping that as a result of the Conferences, the imminent Orthodox Pro-Synod would sanction "some measure, however limited and guarded, of authorized intercommunion."¹²³ The Archbishop of Thyatira made a suitable reply for the Orthodox, and the Commission started immediately on its task.

At the outset of the discussions both sides made it clear that what was said and done there would not be binding on the Churches they represented until their respective authorities had approved. Germanos rather pointedly added that "Sacramental Communion will follow as the last step of the process when complete dogmatic agreement has been established and unity has taken place."¹²⁴ The first term, which put the Christian faith as the Holy Scriptures, the Creed, and the universally accepted decisions of the Ecumenical Councils of the undivided Church, was declared by Germanos to be only a partial declaration of revelation; he added, therefore, holy tradition as it is taught by the Church. This aroused fears on the part of the Archbishop of Dublin that there might be undeclared "stores of tradition"; subsequent discussion resulted in an *impasse*, and the matter was postponed for later consideration. In its final form, as drafted by a subcommittee, the "Tradition of the Church" was included as a part of the Christian revelation, leaving its interpretation to be found in the agreement on "Scripture and Tradition."¹²⁵

Both sides agreed to the canon of Holy Scripture as declared in the second term, which numbered twenty-two books of the Old Testament

¹²² *Report of Joint Commission*, pp. 3, 21.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 25; 8.

as contained in the Hebrew canon, and twenty-seven books of the New Testament; the deuterocanonical books were not to be called apocrypha.¹²⁶ The third term stated that everything necessary for salvation was contained in Holy Scripture, while the tradition that agreed with Holy Scripture was to be followed. Discussion showed that the Orthodox wished this to be understood in the sense that Scripture and tradition constitute two sources of revelation, whereas the Anglicans wished to link them together in an indefinite way that left tradition as a mere means of interpreting Scripture.¹²⁷ Accordingly, reconciliation had to be sought by a subcommittee which produced an agreement in the form of separate statements wherein the Anglicans insisted that all things necessary for salvation are contained in Holy Scripture, but the Orthodox asserted that tradition completes Holy Scripture; these statements were then combined in this compromise: "Everything necessary for salvation can be founded upon Holy Scripture as completed, explained, interpreted, and understood in the Holy Tradition, by the guidance of the Holy Spirit residing in the Church."¹²⁸

No difficulty was expressed over accepting the fourth term, which approved the Nicene Creed. On the fifth term, however, agreement could not be reached; this term accepted the exposition of faith given at the Council of Chalcedon. In addition, the Orthodox wished to extend approval to the decrees of all the Ecumenical Councils of the Orthodox Church. This would, of course, have demanded the acceptance of the decisions of the Second Council of Nicea in regard to the worship of icons and the invocation of saints, so the Anglicans stated that such an extension merely brought back the question of the first term, which had not been settled.¹²⁹ It also was necessary to re-draft the sixth term on the creed of the Church; this resulted in an agreement accepting the Nicene Creed as the official creed but allowed the use of other creeds in baptism and in the services of the Church, provided that they agreed with Scripture and tradition.¹³⁰

The doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost, as contained in the seventh and eighth terms, was agreed upon in a form which rejected any implication of two principles in the procession, but accepted, as lawful

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 28-29.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-12.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 30-31.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

theological opinion, the formula of the Greek Fathers, "from the Father through the Son." Nothing was resolved upon regarding the use of the *Filioque* because of practical difficulties which the Orthodox would encounter if they sanctioned it.¹⁸¹

The ninth term was not concerned with doctrine, but the tenth term considered the number and nature of the sacraments. Discussion on the sacraments did not progress harmoniously, and the final resolution had to be expressed in separate statements. The Orthodox insisted on the full sacramental nature of the seven sacraments while granting the pre-eminence of baptism and the Holy Eucharist. The Anglicans placed these two as the only sacraments instituted by Christ Himself and as universally necessary for salvation, but the others could be called sacraments as having an outward sign and an inward spiritual grace.¹⁸²

At the request of Germanos the articles on the Eucharist from the Lambeth Resumé were read but not discussed again, despite the fact that the Patriarch of Alexandria had requested an improvement in terms eleven and twelve, which dealt with this subject, when he approved the terms as a basis of discussion, and despite the further fact that the Resumé stated that the Anglican explanation was agreeable to the Orthodox, "if an explanation were to be set out with all clearness."¹⁸³ The same fate awaited the last term, which dealt with the sacred icons. Other matters, which need not concern us here, were discussed before the close of the conferences; the agreements reached were to be referred to the respective church authorities for approval.

The above analysis of the work of the Commission gives a fair idea of the extent of doctrinal agreement reached and of the disagreement which remained; it has been rather detailed because of the Commission's official character and scope. We ought, however, to sum up a few points in order that the extent of the progress towards unanimity, or the lack of it, may be made more apparent. In the first agreement, regarding revelation, the Orthodox deserted their opinion of an earlier day by omitting the so-called deuterocanonical books from the canon of Holy Scripture. The old dispute regarding the relation of Holy Scripture to tradition was not settled beyond the point of a verbal agreement as to the meaning of tradition, which could be taken to mean

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 31-33; 14.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, pp. 35-36.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, pp. 56; 54.

the "completion" of Holy Scripture, in one sense by the Anglicans, but in another by the Orthodox. Although the question of the legality of the use of the *Filioque* was omitted, a definite concession was made by the Orthodox when they accepted the doctrine contained in the phrase, even if it was only as a legitimate theological opinion. The Anglicans made the same verbal concessions to the Orthodox doctrine of the seven sacraments as previous individual Anglicans had done, but the real disagreement was made apparent by the issuing of separate statements; the particular doctrine on the Eucharist and holy orders remained in the state of doubt of the Lambeth Conferences. No progress whatever was made on the questions of the Ecumenical Councils to be accepted, the worship of icons, and the invocation of saints.

The tenuous nature of the agreements reached was confirmed by subsequent comment in both Anglican and Orthodox circles. Thus, a writer in *The Christian East* pointed out that the Anglicans did not agree that Holy Scripture is "supplemented" by tradition because the Orthodox did not ask them to do so; moreover, he added, it still remained to be determined whether the Orthodox and the Anglicans were in agreement as to the organs by which tradition declares the faith and as to the contents of that faith.¹³⁴ Nicolas of Hermopolis, reporting to the Holy Synod of Constantinople for the Church of Alexandria, stressed the lack of agreement on the two sources of Christian faith, the impossibility, for the Orthodox, of leaving the *Filioque* in the Creed, and the necessity for more explicit agreement by the Anglicans with Orthodox teaching regarding the sacraments.¹³⁵ Germanos, Constantinides, and Bratsiotis all wrote in a similar vein. Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, Archbishop of Athens, went so far as to say that "a veritable dogmatic abyss separates us from the Anglicans."¹³⁶ Meanwhile, the Orthodox Pro-Synod, which was to meet at the Vatopedion monastery of Mount Athos, June 18, 1932, to consider these matters, was not convened, because of interference by the Turkish Government and dissension on the part of the Serb Patriarch.¹³⁷

¹³⁴ *CE*, XII (1931-32), 124-5.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, XIII (1932), 87-91.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, XIV (1933), 17-23; Hiéromoine Pierre ("Anglicans et Orthodoxes," *Irénikon*, IX [1932] 152-68) cites the comment in Orthodox reviews.

¹³⁷ *CE*, XV (1935), 54.

THE RUMANIAN CONFERENCES OF 1935

The Anglicans now felt that it was up to the individual autocephalous churches to deal with the question of Anglican orders; hence Canon Douglas urged them at every opportunity "to get on with the business."¹³⁸ Since the "Rumanian thesis" had been largely responsible for the Anglican declarations at the Conferences of 1930, it was made evident that the Rumanians were the ones to take the initiative. Consequently, on the occasion of a visit to London in July, 1934, by Bishop Semedria of Targovast, it was suggested, and later agreed upon, that an English delegation be sent to Rumania for conferences that would allow a formal examination of Anglican orders.¹³⁹

In accordance with this plan, a Committee of Anglicans and Orthodox was appointed; it convened in Bucharest from June 1 to 10, 1935.¹⁴⁰ The manner of procedure, which had previously been settled by correspondence, called for the reading of two papers, one by an Orthodox and the other by an Anglican, upon set subjects related to the question, after which discussion followed "until the Rumanians were exhausted."¹⁴¹ At the end, a Report was drawn up stating the agreements that had been reached, but owing to the illness of Monsignor Lucian, the Rumanian chairman of the Conference, the Holy Synod could not consider it until the spring of 1936. After its meeting on March 21, a telegram was dispatched to Canon Douglas informing him that the Rumanian Synod had unanimously accepted the Report.¹⁴²

The agreements made were soon published in England. We shall indicate them in a summary manner.¹⁴³ The Thirty-nine Articles were declared by the Anglican delegation to be a document of secondary importance, to be interpreted authoritatively by the Book of Common Prayer. They accepted the statement of the Rumanian Committee which declared that the Last Supper was an anticipation of the sac-

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 55.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 56.

¹⁴⁰ Dom M. Schwarz, "La visite des Anglicans à Bucarest," *Irénikon*, XIII (1936), 45-61.

¹⁴¹ *CE*, loc. cit.; *Report of the Conference at Bucarest from June 1st to June 8th, 1935, between the Rumanian Commission on Relations with the Anglican Communion, and the Church of England Delegation appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1936), pp. 4-5. This will be referred to as *Report*.

¹⁴² *CE*, XV (1935), 65; Dom M. Schwartz, art. cit., pp. 217; 359.

¹⁴³ *Church Times*, May 22, 1936; *Report*.

rifice of the Cross whereon our Lord expiated the sins of all men; that the sacrifice of Calvary is perpetually presented in the Holy Eucharist in a bloodless fashion under the form of bread and wine, in order to make the fruits of the sacrifice of the Cross available; that in a mysterious way the bread and wine become by consecration the Body and Blood of our Lord, and remain so as long as the Eucharistic elements exist; that those who receive the Eucharistic bread and wine truly partake of the Body and Blood of our Lord.¹⁴⁴

Both delegations agreed to a statement regarding Holy Scripture and tradition which was practically the same as that of the Joint Commission.¹⁴⁵ Further discussion was desired on the subject of the sacraments, but the Anglicans, with the approval of the Rumanians, recommended for the consideration of the Holy Synod a formula which agreed that the other five rites are "also Mysteries in which, an outward visible sign being administered, an inward spiritual grace is received."¹⁴⁶ Man's sanctification was declared to be by means of the Church and the holy sacraments, through the working of the Holy Ghost; man partakes of the grace of the redemption through faith and good works.

The Rumanian Commission declared that since the Anglican declarations on the apostolic succession, holy orders, Holy Eucharist, holy mysteries in general, tradition, and justification were in accordance with the doctrine of the Orthodox Church, it recommended that the Holy Synod recognize the validity of Anglican orders.¹⁴⁷

These statements, taken at their face value, show a remarkable development in Anglican terminology towards expressing their agreement with the doctrine of the Orthodox. Thus, the relation between the sacrifice of the Cross and the Eucharistic sacrifice is portrayed in the words: "The sacrifice on Calvary is perpetually presented in the Holy Eucharist in a bloodless fashion under the form of bread and wine"; then the fruits of the sacrifice of the Cross are said to be partaken of through the Eucharistic sacrifice, in which the bread and wine become by consecration the Body and Blood of our Lord, remaining so as long as the elements exist.¹⁴⁸ Agreement on the questions of tradition and the sacraments advanced in the manner of expression, inasmuch as separate statements regarding the meaning of tradition were

¹⁴⁴ *Report*, pp. 6-7.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

¹⁴⁷ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

omitted, and the previous Anglican references to the indefinite number of sacraments and the limitations in the Book of Common Prayer were dropped.

The extent to which these agreements could be termed the official mind of the two Churches was revealed in subsequent events. In May, 1936, the report was presented to the Convocation of York, which passed the following resolutions: "That this Synod thankfully accepts and approves the Report and trusts that it may lead to yet closer relations with the Rumanian Church and other branches of the Orthodox Communion."¹⁴⁹ This motion was carried, it should be noted, on the supposition explained by the seconder and confirmed by the Prolocutor of the House, that a vote for the motion would not imply approval of all the doctrinal statements in the Report.¹⁵⁰ The Convocation of Canterbury had more difficulty in stating its position, since Bishop Barnes objected that "there would be many people who would not endorse some of the statements in the report." Prebendary Hinde said that "the statements contained in the Report were not compatible with the Prayer Book and the Thirty-nine Articles"; while Canon Guy Rogers felt that it "was not compatible with the teaching of the Church of England."¹⁵¹ Their resolution, as a consequence, expressed thanks to the Commission but put off further consideration of the Report.¹⁵²

Meanwhile, a period of rather sharp controversy developed in England. On the occasion of the visit of the Rumanian Patriarch Cristea to London, in June, 1936, the Low Church party sent a protest, signed by fifteen prominent Evangelical clergy, including six heads of theological colleges, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the request that he communicate it to the Patriarch.¹⁵³ Mr. Albert Mitchel, President of the National Church League, wrote to the *Record* of May 29, attacking the agreements of the Delegation and claiming that they had committed an "enormous and criminal blunder." Bishop Knox wanted a message sent by Anglican clergymen to the Holy Synod, denying that there are more than two sacraments. The *Record* defended the position of the Reverend Hale Amos, who declared that the Thirty-nine Articles should govern the Prayer Book, and hence

¹⁴⁹ *CE*, XVII (1937), 7.

¹⁵² *CE*, *loc. cit.*

¹⁵⁰ *Messenger*, *op. cit.*, pp. 655-6.

¹⁵³ *Messenger*, *loc. cit.*

¹⁵¹ *Loc. cit.*

that the Church of England had been misrepresented at Bucharest; this viewpoint was defended in detail by the Secretary of the Church Association in a letter to the Patriarch Cristea.¹⁵⁴ Dr. MacDonald, one of the members of the delegation to Rumania, replied to this line of attack in two long articles in the *Record* of October 30 and November 6. His arguments for the supremacy of the Prayer Book over the Articles were drawn from the Articles themselves, which he interpreted in a manner consonant with the Report: this the *Record* called a travesty of Reformation history. Along these lines the controversy continued.¹⁵⁵

With this background in mind, the Convocation of Canterbury met in January, 1937, and passed the following resolution: "That inasmuch as the Report of the Conference at Bucharest between the Rumanian Commission on relations with the Anglican Communion and the Church of England Delegation appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury is consonant with Anglican formularies and a legitimate interpretation of the faith of the Church as held by the Anglican Communion, this House accepts and approves of the Report."¹⁵⁶ The meaning of the key words in this approval was indicated by Bishop Headlam when he said that a "legitimate interpretation" meant that the agreements presented in the Report were not the only permissible or rightful interpretation of the formularies, but only that of some Anglicans, since each party in the Anglican Church interprets its Catholic faith with a different nuance, and the Church must be taken as it is.¹⁵⁷

In Rumania, a similar reaction of controversy ensued when the public became aware, through the English records, of the contents of the Report. The Orthodox theologian, Gala Galaction (Parintele Pici Pescu), professor of Holy Scripture at Chisinau, ran a series of articles in the *Curentul* of Bucharest during the fall and winter of 1936-37, in which he attacked the Anglicans as heretics and deplored the official apostasy of the Rumanian principals. The point that seemed to displease him most was the sacrifice of the word "transubstantiation" in the agreements. The doctrine of transubstantiation was essential, he argued, for the whole concept of the sacrifice and the priesthood; it was the orthodox doctrine of St. John Chrysostom, Peter Moghila, the Oriental patriarchs, and the individual synods. When the Reformers,

¹⁵⁴ *Documentation catholique*, (1937), 459-60.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 562-5.

¹⁵⁶ *CE*, *loc. cit.*

¹⁵⁷ *Documentation catholique*, *loc. cit.*

including the Anglicans, rejected this doctrine, they rejected everything connected with it, and so they could not be at one with the teaching of the Orthodox in this matter.¹⁵⁸

A minor journal, the *Blasul Monahilor*, made similar charges, somewhat bitterly complaining that the Anglicans had arranged their doctrines and gained their desire, but asserting that the Orthodox responsible ought to pour ashes on their heads.¹⁵⁹ The general Association of Clergy published a motion in the *Universul* declaring the necessity of a categorical declaration by the Anglican communion accepting the Orthodox doctrine and tradition, and maintaining that the final word must remain with an ecumenical council of the Orthodox Church.¹⁶⁰ Such comments indicate the discontent among sections of the clergy over the results of the Conferences; but many of the hierarchy, it seems, looked with favor on the *rapprochement*.

It is clear from what has been said about the manner in which the Report was approved by the Convocations of the Church of England and about the reactions in both countries that the ultimate advance in doctrinal agreement amounted to an official English statement that those members who wished to do so might legitimately hold the doctrines agreed upon at Bucharest. The Rumanians, for their part, considered this amount of party agreement sufficient to warrant the acceptance of Anglican orders by "economy." It was to become definitive for the whole Anglican communion when the synods of the other Churches and followers of the communion ratified the statements of the delegation.¹⁶¹

OTHER CONFERENCES

The Orthodox were represented at the Oxford Congress on "Life and Work," July 12-20, 1937, and at the Edinburgh meeting of the "World Conference on Faith and Order," August 31-18, 1937. There was no question at either of these meetings of Anglo-Orthodox *rapprochement* as such, but a statement of their position in regard to certain points of doctrine which the Orthodox found it necessary to declare at Edinburgh confirmed their attitude towards the Anglicans on these questions. Briefly, they reiterated their Lausanne declaration on the

¹⁵⁸ *Union des églises*, (1937), 174-5.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 176-78.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 179.

¹⁶¹ *CE*, XVI (1936), 15.

importance of tradition, stressing the fact that "the Word" (i.e., written and preached) is not so important as the church in the work of salvation, since it comes from the church. The church itself, they believed, is visible, and only one true church can be visible and exist on earth. The seven sacraments, they declared, are founded upon Holy Scripture and holy tradition; only those are valid which are administered by a canonically ordained minister and rightly performed according to the sacramental order of the church. This was made particularly clear in regard to the Holy Eucharist, "which is the extension of the only and once offered sacrifice of our Lord," in which "the offered gifts by virtue of the consecration are changed (*μεταβάλλονται*) into the very Body and the very Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and given to the faithful for the remission of sins and life everlasting." Finally, they insisted that intercommunion was to be the crowning act of a previous complete reunion in the realm of faith and order, and that this faith was to be based on "the dogmatic teaching of the ancient Church as it is found in the Holy Scriptures, the Creed, the decisions of the Ecumenical Synods and the teaching of the Fathers and in the worship and in the whole life of the undivided Church."¹⁶²

The advent of the war prevented further official negotiations between Anglicans and Orthodox, but the Church of Greece gave its decision on Anglican orders on September 21, 1939. Four members of the theological faculty of the University of Athens had been appointed to examine the question and present their findings to the Holy Synod. After considering their report, the Holy Synod declared that the Church could, after examination of special circumstances, recognize by "economy" the orders of an Anglican cleric joining Orthodoxy. The dogmatic part of the papers prepared by the professors portray the relative agreement and disagreement of the two communions in a manner that confirms our own conclusions, which can now be summarised.¹⁶³

The theological doctrines which have been principally under discussion during all the years of relations and upon which no agreement has been reached, may be enumerated as follows: (1) the concept of

¹⁶² Cf. *The Second World Conference on Faith and Order*, edited by Leonard Hodgson (New York, 1938), pp. 154-8; notes on pp. 353, 356, 358, 360.

¹⁶³ J. Gill S.J., "The Orthodox Church of Greece and Anglican Orders," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, VI (1940), 239-44.

the church; (2) the precise extent of revelation; (3) the precise conditions necessary for full reunion; (4) the number of Ecumenical Councils; (5) the necessity of certain sacraments; (6) the use of the *Filioque*; (7) the place of the invocation of saints and the worship of icons.

Partial official agreement, in the sense that the Orthodox Churches which have recognized Anglican orders have accepted statements made by Anglican representatives and approved by the Church of England Convocations as legitimate Anglican belief, has been reached on the following points: (1) the relation of Scripture to tradition; (2) authority in the church; (3) the seven sacraments; (4) the nature of purgatory; (5) prayers for the dead; (6) holy orders; (7) the Real Presence in the Eucharist; (8) the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass. In the light of the evidence which has been presented, these agreements must be considered as sectional and in some points as merely verbal.

There is at present, then, despite the efforts expended, no immediate prospect of doctrinal unity between Anglicans and Orthodox. The members of the Anglican communion who are anxious for *rapprochement* rarely speak of the differences between the churches; but the Orthodox are perhaps more outspoken regarding the extent of separation. Among the more recent utterances which stress this divergence are those of the Patriarch of Alexandria, Christophoros,¹⁶⁴ of the Metropolitan Germanos,¹⁶⁵ and of Professor P. N. Trembelas of the University of Athens.¹⁶⁶ They all stress the Protestant aspect of the Anglican communion.

¹⁶⁴ *Irenikon*, XVI (1939), 461-3, citing an interview by Reuter.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, XVIII (1945), 81, citing his article in *Orthodoxia*.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 51-7, translating his report on an unofficial conference with an Anglican delegation at Athens in May, 1940, from *Ekklesia*.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.