

departing from the Apostolic message or by an alliance with the world. In some measure all communions have fallen prey to the peril.

The Church is not what it ought to be. When every section of Christendom approaches "Church Relations" in this penitent spirit and is willing to return to the Lord Himself as the centre of Life and Truth and Power, then the movement will have begun toward better understanding of "the pattern in the mount" which must be realized here below.

In the New Testament the Church is both actual and ideal. There is a double element. "We are and yet we await the Church." This expectation is enshrined in the Creed, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church". It is in being and yet it has not yet become an object of sight. Our whole task as Christians is to become what we are.

Nonconformity and Reunion

BY THE REV. E. C. DEWICK, M.A., D.D.

I. The Reunion Movement in the Twentieth Century

THIRTY-FIVE years ago, I was in the City of Oxford, attending the first Mansfield College Conference of Anglicans and Free Churchmen on the subject of the Reunion of Christendom. The Reunion Movement had been growing in strength during the first two decades of this century; and it reached its peak about that time, when the two Mansfield Conferences were held, and the Appeal to All Christian People was issued from the Lambeth Conference of 1920.

The two Mansfield Conferences both passed similar resolutions, urging that (as a means to *promote* Reunion, and not only *after* Reunion had been consummated), "Interchange of Pulpits," and "mutual admission to the Lord's Table", should be sanctioned between the Churches represented at the Conference, which included Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregationalist, and Baptist. At the first Conference, the Anglicans were mostly of the Evangelical school; at the second Conference, the signatories included outstanding leaders of other schools of thought, such as William Temple, Oliver Quick, Charles Raven, Dick Sheppard; and even liberal Anglo-Catholics, such as Canons Lacey and Percy Dearmer.¹

These resolutions, endorsed by such weighty signatures, aroused widespread hopes that the Church of England was about to enter into a fellowship with the Free Churches in the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, similar to that which the majority of the Free Churches have always practised among themselves.

These hopes were further encouraged by the Appeal to All Christian People by the Anglican Episcopate, also published in 1920. The stirring words of the Appeal, with its noble vision of a great united Church, and its call to "an adventure of goodwill, and still more, of faith",² struck a new note in inter-Church relationships, and touched

¹ See *S.P.C.K. Documents, 1916-1920*, pp. 77-86.

² *Lambeth (1920) Report*, pp. 26-28.

the heart of Protestant Christendom.

All this took place some thirty-five years ago. How far have those hopes been fulfilled?

In certain directions, the last thirty-five years have certainly seen some very real advances. From the Anglican side, concessions have been made (at least verbally) which would have surprised—and perhaps shocked—our forefathers a century ago.

(1) Our leaders have admitted that the responsibility for “our unhappy divisions” does not rest only with “the schismatic bodies”, but must be shared in part by the Church of England.¹

(2) In 1923, a Memorandum was issued, signed by the Primates of Canterbury and York, and by a number of bishops and clergy of known High Church principles, in which they said :

“We find it impossible to regard Free Church ministries as invalid, in the sense of null and void. We regard them as, in their spheres, real ministries of Christ’s Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church”.²

(3) While the Anglicans have always asked that Free Church ministers should accept episcopal ordination, they have also assured them that they would not thereby be considered to repudiate their past ministry, but only to enrich it; and the Anglican authorities have affirmed *their* willingness, in that event, to receive from the authorities of the Free Churches a commission to minister to their congregations.³

These concessions from the Anglican side have not been trivial. They indicate a complete change from the attitude of many of our Anglican forefathers towards Dissenters. I think that we to-day often fail to realize what that attitude really was. Take, as an example, this passage from the *Sermons* of a prominent Tractarian, the Rev. S. H. Cassan, in 1829 :

“Dissenting ministers are mere laymen; and not only so, but, as Uzziah was, unhallowed intruders into the sanctuary”, from whose ministrations “it would be impious to expect any blessing”.⁴

In contrast to this, we find to-day that even the majority of Anglo-Catholics, though refusing to allow that non-episcopal ministries are valid, proceed (perhaps with more courtesy than consistency) to admit that “they have been abundantly blessed by the Holy Spirit”.⁵

Nor have concessions been made only from the Anglican side. In spite of the traditional Nonconformist antipathy to bishops, the majority of Free Church leaders have repeatedly offered to accept an episcopal form of government, if Church Union is achieved. This was agreed to at the Faith and Order Conferences (Lausanne, 1927, and Edinburgh, 1937);⁶ it has been embodied in the recent Reunion

¹ *Lambeth Appeal*, 1920, § III.

² Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity*, Vol. I, No. 46.

³ *Lambeth Appeal* 1920, § VIII, and Archbishop Fisher’s Cambridge Sermon, 1946: “*A Step forward in Church Relations*”, p. 9.

⁴ *Sermons*, p. 84.

⁵ E.g. Bishop Kirk, in *The Apostolic Ministry*, p. 40; cf. the *Lambeth Appeal*, 1920 § VII, and the *Lambeth Report*, 1930, p. 116.

⁶ Bell, *Documents*, I, No. 91, and III, No. 211.

Schemes (proposed and recommended by both sides) in the U.S.A., Canada, Australia, North India, and Iran ;¹ and it has been incorporated into the Constitution of the Church of South India.²

These mutual concessions have been brought about through a long succession of conferences and joint committees, which have brought the leaders together, enabling them to know each other personally, and to understand each others' principles. Together with this, the disappearance (in large measure) of the old social and political differences between 'Church' and 'Chapel' has removed an obstacle to unity which in the past has been quite as formidable as any theological disagreements.

The result of all this has been what Bishop Bell of Chichester has called "a complete change in the general relationships between the Churches", and "a new climate of understanding and friendship, especially among the leaders".³ The importance of this can hardly be over-emphasized ; for as long as there was contempt on the one side, and resentment on the other, no real progress towards unity was possible.

Out of this 'new atmosphere' has come, in turn, one of the most important practical achievements in modern Church History—namely, the formation in many lands of inter-Church National Christian Councils, and of the World Council of Churches, founded in 1948.

In all this, there is indeed much for which we must give thanks to God.

There is, however, another side to the picture, which must be frankly recognized. In this country, at least, in spite of the growing friendliness in spirit and in speech, there has been little or no corresponding growth in *acts* of Christian fellowship. The reasons for this are to be found on both the Anglican and Free Church sides.

The Anglican proposals have always insisted that the acceptance of episcopacy and of episcopal ordination must *precede* any general authorization of such acts of fellowship as Interchange of Pulpits or Intercommunion.⁴

The Free Churches, on the contrary, have always urged that Interchange of Pulpits and Intercommunion would do more than anything else to *create* a sincere desire for union among the rank and file of Christians of all denominations, and should therefore be sanctioned here and now (as recommended by the Mansfield Conferences), to prepare the way for organic union.⁵

The Free Church leaders have also made it clear that, while the majority of them are ready to accept an episcopal form of government in a United Church, as conducive to material and spiritual efficiency, they firmly refuse to admit, either directly or by implication, that episcopacy is *essential* for a Church, or that their own ministries *must* in all cases be supplemented by episcopal ordination, before they are

¹ do., III, Nos. 193, 200, 201, 203 and 209.

² Chapter IV.

³ Bell, *Christian Unity* (1948), p. 120.

⁴ Lambeth (1920) Appeal ; and Bell, *Documents*, I, No. 44, 46 ; II, 121 ; III, 146, 175.

⁵ Bell, *Documents*, I. Nos. 30-40 ; II. 126 ; III. 17.

entitled to be given any *practical* recognition by the Church of England.¹

With regard to the Anglican Memorandum of 1923 (which after professing to recognize non-episcopal ministries as 'real', went on at once to say: "Even so, they may be irregular or defective", and re-affirmed the rule of episcopal ordination as "much more than a rule of internal discipline"), the Free Church Federal Council replied at once:

"We regret that the plan suggested is precisely that which would be followed in the case of laymen, possessing no kind of ministry. . . . What is conceded in language is not to be given effect to in practice".²

Since then, a few concessions have been made from the Anglican side; but these have failed to deal with the points which the Free Churches hold to be vital.

(i) The Anglican proposals, while invariably demanding the acceptance of episcopacy, have not insisted on any one *interpretation* of it.* But the persistent refusal to allow any *practical* recognition of non-episcopal ministries—even for an interim period, as *has* been done in the Church of South India—seems to Free Churchmen to show that the Anglican authorities do *really* consider episcopacy to be *absolutely* essential.⁴

(ii) "General interchange of pulpits" was forbidden by Lambeth, 1920⁵; and Convocations, in 1943, were prepared to allow it only "in particular and exceptional circumstances", after the bishop has given special permission.⁶

(iii) Similarly, Convocations would only permit the admission of Free Church members to our Communion after each case has been submitted to the Bishop for his special sanction.⁷

(iv) Permission for Anglicans to receive Communion from Free Church ministers was stated by Lambeth 1920 to be "contrary to the general Rule of the Church".⁸ Lambeth 1930, while re-affirming this, was willing to allow exceptions on the foreign mission field, in areas where no Anglican ministrations are available;⁹ but Convocations, in 1953, refused to admit that these exceptions were ever applicable in England.¹⁰

Such concessions as these have done little or nothing to help forward the cause of Christian Unity. To my mind, they are grudging and niggardly; their attitude is one of patronizing toleration towards inferiors, rather than of generous welcome to fellow-members in the one Body of Christ. It is not surprising that (as far as I can gather)

¹ See (e.g.) Dr. Hugh Martin, *The Free Churches and Episcopacy* (1952), pp. 5f.

² Bell, Documents, I. No. 47.

³ Lambeth Conference Reports, 1930, p. 114, 1948, p. 50.

⁴ See *Church Relations*, Chap. v. 3; cf. Dr. Hugh Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

⁵ Lambeth, 1920. Resol'n. 12. B.1.

⁶ See *Resolutions of Convocation* (S.P.C.K. 1954), p. 9 f.

⁷ *do.*, p. 11 f.

⁸ Resol'n 12, B. ii.

⁹ Resol'n 42.

¹⁰ S.P.C.K., *op. cit.*, p. 11.

requests for episcopal permits have been rarely made, and not always granted. I know that the effect on many Free Churchmen has been to irritate rather than conciliate, because the issues which to their minds are vital have been evaded rather than faced.

Since 1925, little or no further progress has been made. Bishop Bell of Chichester, preaching before the University of Cambridge three years ago, said: "We are no further forward in 1951 than we were in 1920".¹ Those words remain equally true in 1954.

In 1946, Archbishop Fisher made a gallant attempt to break the stalemate, by his Cambridge sermon,² in which he suggested that instead of trying to draw up further schemes of union, the Free Churches should, without waiting for Union, "take episcopacy into their systems" for an experimental period. All who listened to the Archbishop's sermon were deeply impressed by its sincerity, humility, and obvious concern for the cause of Christian Reunion; but so far, it has not led to any decisive change in the situation. At first, there were some who thought that a door of hope had again been opened. But as soon as it became clear that his suggestion implied, not that the Free Churches should themselves consecrate their new bishops, but that they should come to the Anglican bishops for a consecration which would ensure the 'Apostolic Succession',³ then with a few exceptions, mostly among the Methodists, the majority of Free Church leaders said decisively: "We cannot go forward along the lines suggested".⁴

What are the reasons why our Anglican leaders have refused to permit *in practice* acts which seem to be logical deductions from what they have conceded in theory? Of one thing I am convinced; that it is *not* because the majority of them believe such acts to be forbidden by Scripture, or contrary to the Mind of Christ. That was, indeed, the genuine conviction of the old Tractarians; and it was a logical deduction from their dogma that Our Lord had himself appointed the Episcopate to be the one covenanted channel of sacramental grace in the Church. But how many of our bishops to-day really hold that dogma? I am sure, only a very small minority. Among the inferior clergy, there is, no doubt, a larger proportion who still hold it; but among the laity in general (apart from a few who are more ecclesiastical than the clergy themselves) it is viewed with definite dislike. It is also noteworthy that the only serious attempt in recent years to revive the Dogma of Apostolic Succession with uncompromising rigidity—viz., *The Apostolic Ministry*,⁵ by Bishop Kirk and his colleagues—has met with scant approval from responsible Anglican scholars. Dr. Hodgson, Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, has pronounced its main contention "not proven".⁶ Bishop Rawlinson of Derby has called it "fantastic";⁷ and still more recently, the staff and former students of Westcott House, Cambridge (all of whom claim

¹ *The Approach to Christian Unity*, p. 58.

² *A step forward in Church Relations*, Nov. 3rd, 1946.

³ See the *Report*, 'Church Relations' (1950), p. 44.

⁴ Dr. Hugh Martin, in *The Free Churches Episcopacy* (1952).

⁵ 1947.

⁶ *Apostolic Succession* (1947), pp. 12-16.

⁷ *Problems of Reunion* (1950), p. 60.

to be High Churchmen) have shown with convincing evidence that it is devoid of support either from Scripture or from the main tradition of the *Ecclesia Anglicana*.¹ So I think we may say confidently that the Church of England is not being held back from effective 'acts of unity' with the Free Churches by a general Anglican belief in the necessity of the Apostolic Succession.

But what then is the restraining cause? In some cases, perhaps, the natural inertia which is unwilling to explore new paths; or a vague impression that such acts are "forbidden by the Rules of the Church". Others fear lest closer union with the Free Churches should widen the gulf between ourselves and the Churches of the 'Catholic' tradition. But more potent than any of these is the fear lest such action should lead to controversy, or even a fresh schism, within our own communion. Now some of these motives are laudable. But before considering how far they really do forbid any decisive action on our part, it may be well briefly to review the present situation, as it affects us who are clergy of the Church of England.

II. *The Present Situation*

I take it that I am writing for those who sincerely desire to be loyal to the principles of our Church, and to the formularies to which we have given a general assent at our Ordination, while recognizing that these do not themselves claim to be infallible or unchangeable.

(i) In the Book of Common Prayer, there are two statements of special importance for our present theme. One is in the Preface to the Ordinal, in which we read:

"No man shall be accounted to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he hath had episcopal Consecration or Ordination".

The other is the Confirmation Rubric, which says:

"There shall none be admitted to Holy Communion, until such time as he be confirmed".

At first sight, these rubrics may well seem to forbid us to invite any Nonconformist minister to officiate in our churches (either in the pulpit or at the Lord's Table), or any nonconformist to receive the Communion there. But a study of Church History makes it clear that the original motive of these rules was much more political than theological. They were directed against Nonconformity in England as the enemy of the Church-and-State alliance; not against non-episcopal Church-systems as such. This is clear from the fact that for at least a century after the Reformation, some non-episcopal ministers *from the Continent* were admitted to Anglican benefices (with care of souls) in England, without re-ordination.² Even after the Restoration, when the Church's attitude to 'Dissent' became much more bitter, we find the S.P.C.K. sending out to the foreign mission-field Lutheran pastors with no episcopal ordination.³ It is clear then that the

¹ *The Historic Episcopate* (1954).

² See (e.g.) Bishop H. A. Wilson, *Episcopacy and Unity* (1912), Bishop Hunkin, *Episcopal Ordination* (1929), or Norman Sykes, *The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches in the 16th and 17th Centuries* (1949).

³ Hunkin, *op. cit.*, p. 59 f.

Preface to the Ordinal has not been generally regarded in the Church of England as embodying a Divine law to which there can be no exception.

With regard to the Confirmation Rubric, the position is much the same. At the very time when this rubric was inserted, the bishops were supporting the Corporation and Test Acts, which tried to *force* unconfirmed nonconformists to partake of the Communion in their parish churches.¹ Evidently, then, the Confirmation Rubric was simply intended to ensure that the children of our own Church should not be admitted to Communion until they had been properly instructed, and had themselves ratified the Baptismal vows made for them in infancy; it was not directed against the admission of Nonconformists to our Communion.²

(ii) In our 39 Articles, it is significant that in the definition of "the Church" (Art. XIX), there is no mention of episcopacy as one of its essential marks.

I would submit, therefore, that we need not regard our Prayer Book or Articles as forbidding either the interchange of pulpits or intercommunion in our own day. For none of us (I imagine) now regard Nonconformity as a menace to our British Throne or Constitution! I admit that, as they stand, these rubrics do seem to the plain reader, innocent of Church History, to forbid these things; and I wish (though I do not expect) that in any future revision of our Prayer Book or Canons, a note could be added to explain their original purpose.

But what of the Resolutions of Lambeth Conferences and of Convocations? These certainly deserve respectful consideration, as expressing the judgment of our leaders. But I think we ought to say firmly that we have never *pledged* ourselves to obey these; and that if we find, after careful thought and prayer, that as far as we can judge, they have "no sure warrant of Holy Scripture" behind them, then we are justified, by the very principles of our Church,³ in refusing to be bound by them.

III. *What Should we do Now?*

I turn in conclusion to a very practical (or, if you prefer the modern term, a very "existential") question: "Men and brethren, what shall *we do*?"

I imagine that most of us do not believe that episcopacy is absolutely essential for the Church, or that any fundamental or Scriptural principles separate us from the major non-episcopal Churches.

This *ought* to make it easier for us than for others to take the initiative in co-operation with Nonconformists. Yet, in fact, I have often found the deepest *concern* for Christian unity among those whose theological principles make action most difficult. Dr. Sundkler, in his *History of the Church of South India*, has pointed out that a large proportion of its master-builders were High Churchmen or even Anglo-Catholics by tradition. Outstanding among these were Bishops Palmer of Bombay,

¹ Wilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 156, 189 f.

² This interpretation of the Rubric was supported by Archbishop Tait, and by the historian-bishops Stubbs and Creighton.

³ See *Articles VI, XXI*, and the Preface to the Prayer Book, 1662.

Western of Tinnevely, Hollis of Madras, and (in England) Rawlinson of Derby. All these were led, often through great travail of soul, but (as they believed) in response to a call of God, to modify their earlier position, and embark on a new venture of faith; which at length helped to achieve a Reunion (for the first time in Church History) between episcopal and non-episcopal Churches. In comparison with the sacrifices that these men have made in the cause of Unity, it has often seemed to me that the attitude of the rank and file of Evangelical clergy (with some notable exceptions) towards Christian disunion is one of relative acquiescence in 'things as they are'.

But there are, also, I know, Evangelicals who believe, as I do, that a continued refusal to-day to join in Word and Sacrament with those whom we acknowledge to be fellow-members with us in the Church Catholic, and whose ministry we admit to have been ratified by the blessing of God, involves disobedience to a call of God, and a grave responsibility for acquiescing in schisms in the Body of Christ which could be and should be healed. It is primarily to those who share this conviction that I am now about to speak. But first may I mention some things which I believe we should *not* do.

1. We should not, at present, attempt to draw up fresh 'Schemes of Union', nor pass any more pious resolutions, till the ground has been prepared for this by a much larger measure of practical co-operation. The need now is for *action*, not talk.

2. I do not think we should be too hasty in dismissing the ideal of *Federation* as a possible stepping-stone on the way to fuller organic unity. It is not enough to say (as the Archbishop said in his Cambridge sermon): "We do not desire a Federation".

3. We should not blame those whose conscience forbids them to go forward with us. Until we can convince them that their convictions are mistaken, we have no right to urge them to violate their conscience.

4. In our zeal for Unity, we should scrutinize carefully any Scheme of Union which is based on ambiguous formulas, which only *conceal* real differences, without reconciling them; nor should we assent to proposals which tacitly imply what we hold to be untrue. In some of the proposals for 'mutual re-commissioning' (which have the great *practical* merit of giving to *all* ministers—ex-episcopal and ex-non-episcopal—exactly the same status) there is a danger that when this has been effected, we may be told: "Now you have all agreed to come into the Apostolic Succession; and this *shows* that you do really admit it to be *essential*!"

Now I turn from negative to positive suggestions; and ask: What can we, and what should we, do, in the present situation?

1. We can try to shew that in our own parish, 'Church' and 'Chapel' regard each other as allies, and not as rivals or enemies. In the parish where I live—a parish with a definite Anglo-Catholic tradition and practice—we have a joint Christian Council; occasional united services are held, both in the Parish Church and in the Chapel; and Christian appeals are from time to time sent out over the joint signatures of the Vicar and the Baptist minister. It is clear to the

whole village that 'Church' and 'Chapel' regard each other as partners together in a common enterprise. In an adjoining parish, the Vicar has allotted a page in the parish magazine to the local Chapel. In another parish, not far away, a united Sunday evening service is held once a month, in Church and Chapel alternately, the ordinary Chapel or Church service being suspended on that Sunday evening. Such actions are, I believe, *essential*, as a preparation for any closer unity in the days ahead. I know, of course, that they are not always practicable. When I asked a Free Church friend of mine whether such things were being done in his parish, he looked at me with a smile, and said: "Do you *know* our Vicar?" I did; and I realized that no more need be said. Nor is the obstacle always on the Anglican side. Sometimes the answer would be: "Do you know our *Nonconformist minister*?" All the same, I am sure that in this matter of local co-operation in the parishes, much more *could* be done than *is being* done.

2. In such matters as Interchange of Pulpits or Intercommunion, I have indicated that I myself do not consider that we are finally bound by the restrictions laid down by Lambeth Conferences or Resolutions of Convocation. At the same time, we should be careful to abstain from actions that are needlessly provocative, or likely to alienate that large body of Moderate Churchmen and even liberal Anglo-Catholics, who have unmistakably been turning of late towards a more generous attitude,¹ and whose co-operation is absolutely essential for a closer fellowship between our Church *as a whole* and Nonconformity. On the other hand, we should not allow our actions to be paralysed by the fear of that small but conscientious and determined group of rigid Anglo-Catholics, whose eyes are turned exclusively towards Rome or the Eastern Orthodox, and who resist every movement towards the Free Churches, with the cry that their consciences are being violated. I think it is now high time that we "called their bluff", and made it clear to our bishops that the consciences of many loyal Anglicans are being grievously hurt by the successful efforts of a truculent minority to restrict the majority from full fellowship with other branches of the Catholic Church.

I am not advocating "promiscuous interchange of pulpits", or "promiscuous intercommunion". I believe that normally the right pulpit for a Christian minister is in a church of his own denomination, and the right place for a Christian to partake of the Lord's Supper is in his own parish church or his own chapel. But I hold very strongly that when special opportunities arise, such as united services, or on national occasions, we ought to be perfectly free to give or accept invitations to share in the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, without incurring the charge that in so doing we are disloyal to the tradition or principles of our Church.

We should also recognize, I think, that if such actions are to be helpful to-day in promoting real fellowship, they must be *mutual*. The time has gone by when it was thought that the problem of Intercommunion could be solved if we Anglicans occasionally admitted

¹ See, e.g., Bishop Rawlinson's *Problems of Reunion*, or the Westcott House volume *The Historic Episcopate*.

Nonconformists to our Communion. If we are to convince them to-day that we mean what we say, when we profess to regard their ministries and sacraments as real, we must be prepared, on occasion, to *receive* the Sacrament from their hands. Dr. Sundkler points out that the impasse which had been reached in 1946 in the negotiations for unity in South India was only broken by the unequivocal statement of the Anglican bishops in South India, that if union were consummated, they themselves *were ready to receive Communion* from their non-episcopal presbyters.¹ I believe that if a group of Anglican clergy whose names carry weight in the whole Church were to state publicly to-day that they too are ready, on occasion, to exchange pulpits with Free Church ministers and to receive Communion in Nonconformist churches, this would similarly change the whole atmosphere of our negotiations, and break the stalemate which we have now reached.

I know that there are *some* Anglican clergy who have actually partaken of Communion in Nonconformist churches. But my impression is that they are very few; and the average Englishman is unaware that this has ever been done. It is time that those who feel deeply on this issue should stand together, and let their convictions be known.

To those who fear that union with the Free Churches will destroy all hope of union with Rome, or with Eastern Orthodoxy, I would commend these words of Bishop Rawlinson of Derby :

“ We must frankly recognize that the doctrinal intransigence of the Orthodox Churches constitutes a barrier little, if at all, less formidable than that of Roman Infallibility. . . . If the Anglican Churches are not to remain isolated in Christendom, it is towards Churches standing within the tradition of Evangelical Christendom, rather than towards either Orthodoxy or Rome, that our efforts should be directed.”²

No doubt, any decisive action would be met by an outcry in some quarters, and by episcopal displeasure in some dioceses. But I believe that not a few of our bishops would really *welcome* such action as evidence that there is a responsible body of clergy who have strong convictions in this matter; and that it would help them to take a stronger line in resisting the pressure which at present is being put upon them, almost wholly from the Anglo-Catholic side. May I once more quote Bishop Rawlinson :

“ There are Anglicans who feel justified in communicating on special occasion in non-episcopal churches. Their claim must be allowed, as the exercise of a liberty sanctioned by precedent. . . . It is in the highest degree unlikely that those who in a good conscience thus act will find themselves subjected to any form of ecclesiastical censure.”³

Certainly we should not act in such matter “unadvisedly or lightly”, but only if we believe from our hearts that such action is our answer to a call from God. But when that is our conviction, we can but say, with Martin Luther : “ Here stand I ; God help me ; I can do no other ! ”

¹ Sundkler, *op. cit.*, p. 321.

² *Problems of Reunion*, pp. 174 f

³ *Problems of Reunion*, p. 84.