

## THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES AND THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION.

By W. GUY JOHNSON.

IN June, 1935, a Conference to which reference has been made in previous issues of *THE CHURCHMAN*, was held at Bucarest between a Delegation appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and a Commission appointed by the Rumanian Church, in order to discuss points of agreement and of difference between the two Churches with a view to the possibility of arranging for intercommunion. There can be no valid objection to such approaches, and though their practical utility for English Churchpeople may not be very obvious, it is somewhat different for members of the "Orthodox" Churches of which the Rumanian is now the second largest. There are considerable numbers of these scattered throughout England and America in places where they have no access to their own clergy. It would naturally, therefore, be an advantage to those who desire to have the ministrations of clergy of the Anglican Communion, if they might do so with the full approval of their own Church. A converse arrangement would be, of course, contained in such an approval by both sides; and such intercommunion between all who profess and call themselves Christians is greatly to be desired. It should, however, be on a basis which does not jeopardize truth; and it should not be so narrowed as to include only a particular group of unreformed Churches to the exclusion of others but should extend to those Protestant Churches which, like the Church of England, derive their distinctive teaching mediately from the Reformation of the sixteenth century and ultimately from Holy Scripture alone.

The Conference at Bucarest, if judged by the Report, would appear, however, to have very seriously jeopardized the truth so far as the teaching of the Church of England is concerned, and the hope it expresses of "full dogmatic agreement" between the "Orthodox" and the Anglican Communion has since acquired an additional significance by the approval given to it by the Convocations of Canterbury and York. There is, unfortunately, little knowledge among English people generally of the history, doctrines or present state of the Churches of the "Orthodox" Communion, which may in great part account for the small support which the Bishop of Birmingham, the Bishop of Truro, Prebendary Hinde and Canon Guy Rogers received in the Convocations when they protested against the terms of the Report.

It will, therefore, not be out of place to indicate the various Churches which compose the group known as the Orthodox Communion and examine, as briefly as may be, their doctrinal position in order to gather what "full dogmatic agreement" would involve, before attempting to discuss the conclusions reached by the Conference at Bucarest two years ago.

The Orthodox Communion is known generally by three names. "The Eastern Church," as in Dean Stanley's well-known book; "the Greek Church," as in Dr. Adeney's history entitled "The Greek and Eastern Churches"; and, to use their own name, "The Orthodox Church," the title of a book recently published by the Great Archimandrite Michael Constantinides who is the Dean of the Greek Cathedral Church of St. Sophia, in London. The bodies composing the Orthodox Communion are enumerated by Dean Constantinides as follows :

"When we speak of the Orthodox Church, by this term we mean, first, those Churches founded by the Apostles themselves, or the disciples of the Apostles, and which have remained in full communion with one another. Secondly, those Churches which have derived their origin from the missionary activity of the former, or which were founded by separation without loss of communion. To the first class belong the four Patriarchates of Constantinople, of Alexandria, of Antioch, of Jerusalem, and the Church of Cyprus. To the second class belong : (1) the Church of Sinai ; (2) the Church of Russia ; (3) the Church of Greece ; (4) the Church of Yugoslavia ; (5) the Church of Rumania ; (6) the Church of Georgia ; and (7) the Church of Poland. All the enumerated Churches are independent in their own administration of each other, and, at the same time, in full communion with one another. All these Churches, although independent of each other, have the same faith, the same dogmas, the same Apostolic Tradition, the same Sacraments, the same services, and the same liturgies."\*

The list is given in "The Second Survey on the Affairs of the Orthodox Church," published by the Church Assembly, in the following form :

1. The Œcumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople.
2. The Patriarchate of Alexandria.
3. The Patriarchate of Antioch.
4. The Patriarchate of Jerusalem.
5. The Church of Cyprus.
6. The Patriarchate of Russia.
7. The Church of Greece.
8. The Patriarchate of Serbia.
9. The Patriarchate of Rumania.
10. The Church of Bulgaria.
11. The Church of Poland.
12. The Church of Albania.

This "Second Survey" contains much useful information with reference to the past history and present position of the Churches concerned, particularly that of Russia. For a table containing dates when Christianity first came to these Churches, and other particulars, the reader may be referred to the Rev. E. G. Parry's pamphlet "The Divisions of the Church : a Historical Guide" published this year (1937) by the Student Christian Movement.

There is among them, therefore, no one Church claiming jurisdiction and supremacy over the others and certainly not over the rest of Christendom as does the Roman whose supremacy the Orthodox

\* *The Orthodox Church*, p. 49.

Church repudiates as strongly as do the Protestant Churches of the West. Of this Orthodox Communion, the Rumanian Church is a very important member, having, next to the great and unhappy Russian Church, of which no reliable statistics are at present available, though Professor Zankov estimates the number at 120 millions, the largest number of members, variously estimated at from eleven to thirteen millions. There are besides the above-mentioned national or organized Churches, a great number of Orthodox members scattered throughout Europe and North and South America. There is an Archbishopric of North America, under the Patriarchate of Constantinople and an Archbishopric of Japan, under the Church of Russia. The very names of the countries above enumerated where the National religion is Orthodox bring to mind the bitter calamities and trials by which most of them have been beset through the long course of their history and not merely since the outbreak of the Great War in 1914. Everyone will sympathize with them in their distresses and admire the tenacity with which they have contended for and maintained the faith, but neither sympathy nor admiration can blind us to the fact that unhappily their faith contains very much that is corrupt and superstitious, for though they repudiate the supremacy of the Roman Church their doctrines differ on the whole but little from those of Rome. It is true that they have not the same passion for precise definition as the Roman Church, and owing to their comparative isolation from the rest of Christendom they have not been under that necessity of framing exact statements which was forced upon Western Christendom by the controversies of the Reformation in the sixteenth century. It is often, therefore, not easy to know exactly what it is that they hold on particular points or where we may look for information regarding the authorities to which they defer. For example, the Bishop of Gloucester, at a Conference held at Lambeth Palace, in July, 1930, between a special committee of Bishops attending the Lambeth Conference and a Delegation of the Eastern Orthodox Churches, had to enquire "whether it would be possible to find the official teaching of the Orthodox Church on the Doctrine of the Church, the Ministry and the Sacraments?"; and further, asked "what authority was possessed by the Metropolitan Philaret's Longer Catechism of the Russian Church?"\* We shall refer later to the replies to the Bishop's question and to his own statement in regard to them. While, however, it may at times be difficult to learn what is, in precise terms, the Orthodox belief, the general character of the teaching and the sources from which it is derived have always been sufficiently clear and have been much illuminated in the course of the discussions which have taken place since the meeting of the Lambeth Conference in 1920.

It should be remembered that Christianity came from the East; Jerusalem, not Rome, is "the mother of us all"; its earliest conquests were made in the East, e.g., Antioch, Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi; its first General Councils were Eastern; Nicea A.D. 325, Constantinople

\* *The Christian East*. Vol. xii, No. 1, p. 31 (1931).

A.D. 381, Ephesus A.D. 431, Chalcedon A.D. 451, etc. The Creeds are mainly Eastern. The earlier heresies were Eastern. The East and the West were practically agreed upon doctrine for approximately five centuries. Augustine who has been well described as the Father of Western Theology died in the first half of the fifth century. The causes involving the ultimate separation between East and West were many, and the rift which led to it only widened slowly. The addition of the "Filioque" clause to the Nicene Creed, was more the occasion than the cause of division. The reasons were in part political, in part racial and temperamental, in part concerned with ecclesiastical administration and only in part theological. The removal by Constantine of the capital of the Empire from Rome to Constantinople; the division of the Empire into the Eastern Roman Empire and the Western Roman Empire; the disputes regarding precedence between the Bishops of old Rome and new Rome (Constantinople) and the growing claims of the former to supremacy and jurisdiction over the whole Church were potent factors. Moreover, the occupation of the Western Church with the task of absorbing and christianizing the barbarian conquerors of the Empire and the tendency of the Eastern Church to devote itself to speculation on the deeper mysteries of the faith, concerning which speculation too often leads to arid wastes of controversy, produced a marked difference of outlook. There was, therefore, no community of practical interest sufficient to arrest a drift apart which was so gradual as perhaps hardly to be noticeable at any particular moment. But through it all, there was substantial identity of faith and belief. Any differences between East and West were similar to those existing between different sections of either. The same causes which had produced the corruptions of doctrines which we find in the eleventh century had operated in both East and West. Notwithstanding substantial theological agreement, separation had become inevitable. If no other reason existed, the exorbitant claims of the Roman See were sufficient sooner or later to bring it about, and, as a matter of fact, it was the action of the Roman Bishop which effected it at last. Paradoxically enough it was precipitated by an effort on the part of Michael Cerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople, to bring about closer relations with the Western portion of the Church. In 1042, or thereabouts, he addressed a letter to this effect to the Bishops of Apulia, but referred to some difficulties which stood in the way, among them the clause "and from the Son" in the Nicene Creed. A copy of this letter came into the hands of Pope Pius IX who wrote a violent letter to the Patriarch saying that if necessary he would not "seethe the kid in its mother's milk" but "scrub its mangy hide with biting vinegar and salt."\* These amiable sentiments not having the effect of making the Patriarch submit to the Pope's directions, the papal legates formally laid on the altar of St. Sophia "a sentence of anathema, denouncing eleven evil doctrines and practices of Michael and his supporters and

\* Adeney, *The Greek and Eastern Churches*, p. 240, where a reference is given to Mansi XIX, 649. It is interesting to read the quite different account, from the Roman Catholic point of view, in Adrian Fortescue's book, *The Eastern Orthodox Church*, pp. 197-8.

cursing them with the awful imprecation : ‘ Let them be Anathema Maranatha, with Simoniacs, Valerians, Arians, Donatists, Nicolaitans, Severians, Pneumatomachi, Manichees and Nazarenes, and with all heretics ; yea, with the devil and his angels. Amen, Amen, Amen.’” This was on July 16th, 1054. After that, as Dr. Adeney observes, “ The Schism was now complete.” It could not well be otherwise. In much the same spirit, the Roman Church has ever since treated the Eastern, though its formal expression may now be more in harmony with the conventional speech of modern days. It seems at first surprising that with so much of theological belief and practice in common, such an attitude of rancour and malevolence should be adopted, but the claims to Supremacy and Infallibility of the Roman Church, baseless and absurd as they are, are pressed with an arrogance and presumption which will tolerate neither freedom of opinion nor the least criticism of what that Church chooses to lay down for unquestioning acceptance. The Orthodox Church faced with the alternatives of submission or separation chose the latter.

In considering the doctrines which are held by the Orthodox Church, it will not be necessary, if it were possible within the limits of the present article, to discuss Orthodox theology as a whole, in order to see where the path to full dogmatic agreement would lead the Church of England. When the Bishop of Gloucester asked the questions as to Orthodox official teaching, to which reference has already been made, the Patriarch of Alexandria referred him to certain Confessions of the 16th and 17th centuries, especially the catechism of Peter Mogila and the Confession of Dositheus, but added that a special importance was attached to the Decrees of the seven Œcumenical Councils. He further said, in reply to a question from the Bishop, that in case of difference of opinion they would be guided by the opinions of the Church as expressed in the Liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom. The Bishop of Gloucester replied that this method agreed with that of the Church of England, though he refrained from giving any authority other than his own for so extraordinary a statement. It is interesting to read the Patriarch’s reply to the question of the Bishop as to the authority possessed by the “ Longer Catechism of the Russian Church.” The Patriarch said that “ it was the work of one who had especially criticized the Church of Rome and by reaction *was influenced by Protestantism*. It had *not*, however, received any *official* disapproval and any person who made use of its teaching would *not be out of order*,”\* a very fair example of damning with faint praise. We do not think that the Catechism is likely to convey to the ordinary reader any strong impression of Protestant influence. For example, a more important place is given to Tradition than to Scripture and in regard to the latter it is stated : “ we must take and understand it in such sense as agrees with the interpretation of the Orthodox Church and the holy Fathers.” The perpetual virginity of the Mother of our Lord is asserted and the title “ Mother of God ” ascribed to her ; the number of the Sacraments is given as

\* *The Christian East* as previously cited. (Italics are ours.)

seven ; transubstantiation is expressly taught : “ the bread and wine are changed or transubstantiated into the very Body of Christ and the very Blood of Christ ” ; The foregoing quotation is from Blackmore’s translation of Philaret’s Longer Catechism and there has been considerable discussion as to the correctness of “ transubstantiation ” as an equivalent for the Russian word in the text. But it is significant that the Russians have coined a word *Transubstantziatziya*, which, in the Russian translation of the Acts of the Synod of Jerusalem (held in Bethlehem, A.D. 1672), is used to express the doctrine. That word is not the one in Philaret’s catechism, but another, of mixed Russian and Greek construction representing the Greek *Metousiosis* and on that ground it is contended that Blackmore’s translation is incorrect. Much of this is a mere strife about words. Words are often at best imperfect vehicles of human thought. It is what they actually convey that matters. As Dr. Adrian Fortescue says “ As for the word, they (the Orthodox) always say *Metousiosis*, which is an exact version of *Transubstantiation* (*meta*—trans ; *ousia*—substance) . . . Moreover, when Mr. Palmer showed his book with a denial of this faith to the Archpriest Koutnevich, the Archpriest promptly said, “ But we believe and teach Transubstantiation.”\* Fortescue quotes the definition of the Synod of Jerusalem as follows :—“ the bread and wine at the consecration are changed, transubstantiated, converted and transformed, the bread is changed into the very Body of the Lord that was born at Bethlehem from the Ever-Virgin, baptized in the Jordan, suffered, was buried, rose again, sits at the right hand of God the Father, and will come again in the clouds of heaven, and the wine is converted and transubstantiated into the very Blood of the Lord that He shed on the cross for the life of the world.” A summary of the Acts of this Synod is given in E. H. Landon’s “ A Manual of Councils of the Holy Catholic Church ” published in London (Rivingtons) in 1846. It asserted *inter alia* the necessity of Episcopacy ; the invocation of the Virgin Mary and of the Saints ; asserted, as above, Transubstantiation and condemned Consubstantiation ; admitted the doctrine of Purgatory. The Acts are signed by Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem, Nectarius, the ex-Patriarch, seven other prelates, and by sixty-one other ecclesiastics.

The tendency among some modern Orthodox theologians to deny that their Church holds the dogma of transubstantiation appears, when examined, to amount to little more than a dislike for the word itself and a repudiation of the more materialistic explanations and inferences attaching to it ; but this latter sentiment is to be found equally among Roman Catholic writers when pressed with the consequences of the doctrine. But when Orthodox writers state what they do hold, we find that it comes to the same thing in the end. Thus Zankov :—“ The consecrated elements are the true body and true blood of Christ ” ; † or Callinicos :—“ Its solemn words are those contained in the ‘ Invocation ’ by which the Holy Ghost is asked

\* *Op cit*, p. 385.

† *The Eastern Orthodox Church*, p. 117. (Translated and edited by Donald A. Lowrie. S.C.M. 1929.)

to descend upon the Holy Gifts and convert the bread into the Body of Christ, and the wine into His Blood.”\* These and other writers may prudently prefer to reject particular explanations as to *how* this is brought about, but they agree as to the *fact* of the change, though they may not use the word Transubstantiation to describe it; but the doctrine remains the same.

If anything is needed to justify the use of the word “superstitious” as applying to much in the doctrinal and practical system of the Orthodox Churches, it may be found in the place which is given to icons and in the ceremony of the Holy fire in Jerusalem at Eastertide. There is no occasion here to give the history of the Iconoclastic controversy which raged in the Eastern Church from about A.D. 736 for a long period until in A.D. 787 a General Council was summoned to determine whether images and pictures (icons) should be retained in the churches or not. The violent methods by which two reforming Emperors had removed and destroyed the images had in each case produced a reaction equally violent; and it was at the time of one of these reactions that the Council was summoned. It met at Nicea and was the second to be held in that place. It is known as the Seventh General Council, and to its decisions the Orthodox Churches attach very great importance. In the Report of the three Delegates sent to London in 1920, they say “we thought that we should make clear that the acceptance of the Seventh Œcumenical Council as such is indispensable, it being granted that it presents all the marks for acknowledgment and acceptance. The Committee of Bishops assured us that they had taken note of this declaration of ours, and it seems that on this question a favourable wind blows, at least in certain quarters, and it is observed also that in practice † there is a gradual return to the earlier, but of course not superstitious practice of giving honour to the Saints and to their images.” ‡ The Council was mainly concerned with this question of images, though it passed a number of disciplinary canons of which one was that “if in future, a bishop consecrates a church without relics, he shall be deposed.” § On the matter of images, it decreed that where they had been removed they were to be restored “and at them prayers should be offered,” and that incense and lights should be used in their honour.\*\* Those who are in close touch with the religious life of the Orthodox Churches tell us of the predominating influence among the people of the veneration of icons. The Rev. F. S. Cragg, now Vicar of St. Aldate’s, Oxford, who had, when working in Palestine, ample opportunity

\* *The Greek Orthodox Catechism*, p. 42. (Published under the auspices of the Archbishop of Thyateira. Bayswater 1926.)

† Presumably in the Anglican Churches.

‡ Bell. *Op cit.* 63.

§ Hefele. *History of Church Councils*. Vol. 5, p. 380.

\*\* *Ib.* 372, 375.

for observation, wrote, in a paper read before a conference of Lay Churchmen in London :

“ The people are in spiritual chains. This is very evident when we look closely at the life and religion of ordinary Greek Church members. The mass are uneducated peasants, and their priests are men of the people with no more education than they possess themselves. Among such people there is no teaching, and every kind of ignorance and superstition is rampant. The worship of saints and ikons is the basic element in their everyday religion. Morality is low. In the discipline of the Anglican Church in Palestine the chief difficulty is created by the proximity of Greek Christians with a very lax moral code. Nor are the lives of monks or even hierarchs always an example of Christian morality.”

Much ingenious casuistry has been expended upon the defence of image-worship. Distinctions are drawn between *Dulia*, *Hyperdulia* and *Latreia*, the last being due only to God Himself. The reverence, or worship, however it is described, may be claimed to be given not to the image but to the person represented by it, though this is also the defence offered by non-Christian idolators for their practice ; yet centuries of Church history witness to the fact that the irresistible tendency of human nature is to give to the visible and tangible symbol the worship which belongs alone to that which it is supposed to represent.

The ceremony of the Holy Fire which takes place on Easter eve, affords an even greater example of superstition than that attaching to the religious use of images. It has frequently been described. The Hon. R. Curzon gave a melancholy account of it in the year 1834 in his “ Visits to monasteries of the Levant.” Dean Stanley who was in Jerusalem in 1853 and witnessed the ceremony, has described it in his “ Sinai and Palestine.” We borrow from a more recent account, in the paper by the Rev. F. S. Cragg, the following brief description of it.

“ The theory is that fire comes down from heaven and is received by the officiating bishop waiting within the Holy Sepulchre. Outside the tomb are thousands of people, each waiting with a bundle of taper-like candles. At one moment the whole great Church is almost in complete darkness. At the next the light passed out by the bishop flashes from one candle to the next, and almost in an instant the whole Church is lit up by thousands of burning candles . . . I do not know a sadder picture than that of those thousands of men and women carried away in a wave of ecstatic emotion, shouting and singing, men rubbing their hands and faces with the smoke of the burnt-out candles, women rubbing it upon their breasts. For them it is magic. They believe it is from heaven and that belief is encouraged. For them there is no nice distinction between the sign and the thing signified. The basis of it all, so far as they are concerned, is a lie, just as the basis of so much superstitious worship of the sacraments in mediæval England was symbolism. I can only say from my own experience of the Holy Fire that symbolism in itself may be, and often is, the enemy of true religion.”\*

It is doubtless true, as Dean Stanley wrote,† that every educated Greek knows and acknowledges that the Fire, so far from descending from heaven, is kindled by the Bishop within the chapel. But the

\* *Protestantism and the Eastern Churches*. (Published by the World's Evangelical Alliance.)

† *Sinai and Palestine* (New Ed. 1871), p. 468.



people believe, and are encouraged to believe, that it comes from heaven and it is to that belief that the scenes of frenzied fanaticism which accompany the ceremony are due. If the hierarchy do know and admit that the whole thing is false, then there could be no greater condemnation of them than the fact that they continue to pass it on to an ignorant and credulous multitude, knowing that they will believe it to be true.

The direction which Orthodox teaching takes upon such matters as Holy Scripture, Justification, the Sacraments, came out clearly enough in the Conference at Bucarest and agrees with what we have already seen. Before, however, proceeding to consider this, there is one point raised in the Conference at Lambeth in 1930 which is worth noting. The Patriarchs there present appeared to feel very strongly the impropriety of the fact that in the Churches of the Anglican Communion the laity are not merely allowed to offer advice and to express opinions on matters of doctrine; but actually have a vote in their decision. In the report of His Holiness Nectarie on the Conference, we read that "The Patriarch of Alexandria said that an assurance excluding the laity from voting on matters of Faith would be hoped for. And the Bishop of Gloucester said that the Anglican Bishops present were ready to prepare a statement agreeing that such was their opinion." We have not heard of any such statement, but whether it has been prepared or not, the Bishop's answer looks uncommonly like throwing dust into the Patriarch's eyes, for he would naturally gather from the Bishop's words that such an exclusion was to be attempted, while the Bishop himself must be quite well aware that it is not within the sphere of practical politics.

To turn now to the Bucarest Conference of July 1935. The Report was issued last year and it was at once seen, from the agreements arrived at, that the Anglican Delegation had betrayed the position which they were supposed to represent. It occasionally happens in conferences or discussions where a "give-and-take" policy is aimed at, that one side does all the giving while the other does the taking. This appears to have been the case at Bucarest. As in the earlier discussion just mentioned, where the Bishops were prepared to give away the lay vote, so here the Church of England position was misrepresented or explained away, in order that it might seem to agree with Orthodox requirements. Obviously the first thing to do was to repeat the disparagement of the XXXIX Articles which had been taking place ever since these recent approaches to the East began. Articles VI, XXI and XXIV do not deal tenderly with the authority of Tradition or of General Councils. It is as difficult to find the doctrine of the Seven Sacraments in Article XXV as it was, in the Laputan project, to extract sunbeams out of cucumbers. Article XI leaves no more place for good works as helping to procure the justification of a sinner, than do Articles XXVIII and XXIX for the doctrine that the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ. The Orthodox representatives had made some study of these Articles and were clearly uneasy about them, and as long ago as 1920, a delegation of three members who were sent to London at the time of the Lambeth Conference of that year, reported to the

Holy Synod at Constantinople that in view of the fact that "the work of reunion would be strongly advanced by the abolition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Confession," they had ventured to propose that this should be done. The English Bishops anxiously endeavoured to reassure them by such explanations as the following: "the aim of Elizabeth and her counsellors was to find a means to the reconciliation of those of Catholic and Protestant tendencies." It does not seem a hopeful way of conciliating those of "Catholic tendencies" to deny the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome; to denounce the sacrifices of Masses as blasphemous fables; to condemn Transubstantiation and to assert the doctrine of Justification by Faith only; but there it is, and it helped to calm the Delegation. They were also told that "In the last fifty years the Thirty-nine Articles have fallen, while the Creeds have risen, in public estimation. Such words, in addition to others, the President of the Standing Committee spoke, and the President of the Committee of Bishops spoke somewhat as follows: 'we understand that the abolition of the Thirty-nine Articles would be an advantage . . . given an opportunity the Articles might be revised' . . . it was proposed to us by the Standing Committee that our Standing Committee should undertake to suggest what alterations in our opinion are necessary. *As long as no separation between Church and State is made in England . . . only a revision of these Articles will perhaps be possible.* This revision being invested with a competent authority, would evidently, in great measure, *take the place of a final abolition of the Articles.*" The italics are ours. The Report can be read in full in the Bishop of Chichester's volume of "Documents of Christian Unity," published in 1934 by the Oxford University Press, and ought to be studied by all those who would resist the corruption of the teaching of the Church of England. However, the "explanations" and the prospect of revision seem to have satisfied the Orthodox representatives, who found a more hopeful ground of agreement in the "high estimation" of the Prayer Book by Anglicans, "the more so *as it is being steadily amended and revised.* *To this revision we also were invited to contribute.*" Happily, the revision scheme failed, though the foregoing gives an indication of what might have happened had it succeeded.

In view of this recent history, we can understand how it was that agreements seem so easily to have been reached at Bucarest two years ago, but it is difficult to suppose that many of the members of Convocation who voted their approval of the proceedings can have read, or given any serious attention to the documents relating to previous negotiations on the subject, or even to the Report of the Conference itself. The Orthodox delegates have made it clear that they require a full acceptance of their position, while they themselves concede nothing. Their recognition of the validity of Anglican Orders was only given on the understanding that the Anglican Delegation really represented the Church of England; and finding that "their declarations were in accordance with the Doctrine of the Orthodox Church" this recognition followed naturally. In the Conclusion to the Report we find the opinion expressed "that this Conference has prepared

a solid foundation for full dogmatic agreement between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches." In the Conference, agreement was reached on four points. First the subsidiary position of the Thirty-nine Articles in relation to the Book of Common Prayer. In one respect this may be regarded as a comparatively unimportant matter, for there is no opposition between the two. It would be exceedingly difficult to find in the Prayer Book any support for teachings condemned by the Articles. But the point is important practically, for the intention is to weaken the force of the Articles by a subtle form of disparagement less open, but not less mischievous in the impression produced, than the "explanations" of the Bishops, already referred to. The other matters agreed upon were "The Holy Eucharist," "Holy Scripture and Holy Tradition" and "Justification." The "Divine Mysteries," viz. the Sacraments, were discussed, as to whether they were two only or seven, and a formula was presented by the Anglican Delegation which differed materially from that of the Rumanian members. This, however, the Rumanian Commission only agreed to refer to the Holy Synod of Rumania for consideration.

The whole subject of the Report was fully dealt with in a letter sent by the Committee of the National Church League to the Archbishop of Canterbury soon after its appearance; and later, Prebendary Hinde prepared for Convocation a document, giving in parallel columns, (a) Statements in the Report; (b) Quotations from the Thirty-nine Articles; (c) Passages from the Prayer Book; and (d) Quotations from the New Testament. We have only space to note (1) that in regard to the Eucharist it was agreed at the Conference, that "In the Eucharist the bread and wine become by consecration (*metabolē*) the Body and Blood of our Lord. How? This is a mystery"; (2) that on Holy Scripture it was agreed that:—

"The Revelation of God is transmitted through the Holy Scriptures and the Holy Tradition. 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. We agree that by Holy Tradition we mean the truths which come down from our Lord and the Apostles and have been defined by the Holy Councils or are taught by the Fathers, which are confessed unanimously and continuously in the Undivided Church and are taught by the Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit;"

and (3) that on Justification it was agreed that:—

"By the redeeming action of our Lord Jesus Christ, mankind has become reconciled to God. Man partakes of the redeeming grace through faith and good works, and reaches through the working of the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, sanctification by means of the Church and the Holy Sacraments."

The foregoing quotations do not include all that is given in the Report on the particular points, but they contain the substance and show how far the Conference went in departing from the teaching both of the Church of England and of Holy Scripture.

It is not the object of this paper to discourage any effort to promote inter-communion between the Eastern and Anglican Churches. There should be no hindrance to the meeting together at the Lord's Table of all who profess and call themselves Christians and are endeavouring

by their lives to justify that profession, even though they may be far astray in their doctrinal opinions. We pray in the Litany "That it may please Thee to bring into the way of truth all such as have erred and are deceived" and we should believe in the possibility of that prayer being answered. It is lawful to excommunicate men of openly evil lives until they repent and reform; but we need not and should not refuse to meet at His Table any who own Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord, simply because they are in error and have been deceived. In the case of the agreement with the Old Catholic Church, this was reached on the ground that "Inter-communion does not require from either Communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion or liturgical practice characteristic of the other; but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Catholic Faith." Had this precedent been followed at Bucarest, there would have been no protest raised, but it is not possible or proper to keep silence when the official teaching of the Church of England is so grievously distorted and misrepresented as to make it appear to agree with a whole system of doctrine, against which its very existence as a separate and independent Church, is a standing protest. In the coming year the English Church and the whole English people will be invited to celebrate with thanksgiving to Almighty God, the setting up in our Churches of the English Bible. There seems a strange irony in teaching, at such a time, that the Bible needs to be completed and interpreted by the traditions of men as embodied in the decrees of a hierarchical Church. We have in this country been delivered by the Gospel from that bondage, and it will be well for us if we refuse to submit again to its yoke; "It is not a vain thing for you; because it is your life."

---

THE SOUTH AFRICAN MELTING POT. By Desmond K. Clinton, B.D., B.Litt. *Longmans. 3s. 6d.*

In these days it is not necessary to vindicate to thinking men the policy and programme of Christian Missions. During the early days of missionary activity, however, it was otherwise. Much had to be done in the face of opposition from within and without. Government officials were not so friendly that they are, on the whole, in these days. Colonists had their own axe to grind also.

This present study deals with the early days of the London Missionary Society in South Africa, and Mr. Clinton has summarized his aim in the sub-title of his book, "A Vindication of Missionary Policy 1799—1836." Three great names stand out in the work, those of The Rev. Dr. J. T. Vanderkemp, the Rev. John Campbell and Dr. John Philip. The work of each of these is vindicated, in particular that of Dr. Philip, whose ideal is the generally adopted policy of modern missions. The narrative carries one along because of its absorbing interest (see p. viii.). One whole chapter is devoted to the pioneer work at Bethelsdorp, yet there is a thrill throughout the entire story. The last chapter, devoted to "conclusions" is most helpful. Another excellent book has thus been added to an already large library of fine studies on Christian Missions. E. H.